Carolina Planning

Volume 21
Number 2



In this Issue: Teaching Kids About Planning
Atlanta and the Olympics
Microenterprise Development
SLAPP Suits
and more . . .

Editors' Note

This issue of Carolina Planning offers a diverse collection of articles on a range of subjects. It begins with a reprint of Neal Pierce's speech to the 39th Annual North Carolina Planning Association Conference. This speech, which offers a provocative look at the state of planning in North Carolina, was part of the Robert and Helen Siler Lecture Series for the 50th Anniversary of the Department of City and Regional Planning of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The rest of the articles are described below.

- An article by Darrell Cook and Dwight Merriam describes the SLAPP lawsuit, how it is being used, and what opportunities and dangers it poses for plaintiffs and defendants. It contains several case studies and covers new anti-SLAPP legislation from several states.
- Leon Eplan, the Commissioner of Planning and Development for the City of Atlanta, gives a planner's view of the Atlanta Olympics. He describes how this high profile public event has focused attention on correcting nagging planning problems in the city and shows how important the city's comprehensive planning process has been in preparing for the event.
- The Main Street program, as described by Rodney Swink, is concerned with revitalizing downtown areas. This article covers the history of the program and argues that a comprehensive approach to revitalization is needed.
- Mike Cowhig explains how the City of Greensboro benefitted from its application to the Enterprise Community Program, even though the city did not ultimately win the grant. Through the application process, a number of community and public participation activities were initiated.
- In a look at residential segregation in North Carolina, Lance Freeman shows the state of segregation in North Carolina and suggests reasons for continued segregation in communities across the state. He also discusses what this means for society and how it might be addressed in the future.
- Dave Buchholz discusses how a unique microenterprise program centered in Durham, North Carolina has successfully helped dozens of enterpreneurs get their businesses off the ground even when other institutions had expressed doubt that they could do so.
- Wes Hankins and Garry Cooper describe the undergraduate planning programs at Appalachian State and East Carolina Universities, including curriculae and activities of graduates.
- In the final article, Steve Gurley looks at ways that planners can provide students with the opportunity to explore concepts of planning and community design. He describes the efforts that APA and NCAPA have made to help educate our future citizens about planning issues and also provides tips for individual planners on speaking to students.

Merritt Clapp-Smith
Karen Kristiansson

The editors of *Carolina Planning* offer a special congratulations to the Department of City and Regional Planning at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill for 50 years of outstanding education at the master's and doctoral levels. May the next 50 years bring the same success!

EDITORS

Joseph Bamberg

Merritt Clapp-Smith

Karen Kristiansson

Mark Shelburne

Carolina Planning is published twice a year by students in the Department of City and Regional Planning, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, with the assistance of funds from the John A. Parker Trust Fund, the Department of City and Regional Planning, the North Carolina chapter of the American Planning Association, and the Department of City and Regional Planning Alumni Association.

Subscriptions to *Carolina Planning* are available at an annual rate of $12.00, or $20.00 for two years. Back issues are available for $6.00 per issue.

Carolina Planning welcomes comments and suggestions on the articles published. Please address all correspondence to: *Carolina Planning*, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Campus Box # 3140, New East Building, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27599-3140. You can also reach the editors via e-mail at: cp.dcrp@mhs.unc.edu. Submissions are always welcome.

Printed by the University of North Carolina Printing Department on recycled paper.

Cover photo by Herman Huang.

Caralina Planning wishes to thank Bertina Baldwin, Pat Coke, Carroll Cyphert, Carolyn Jones, Holly McBane, and the Center for Urban and Regional Studies.

© 1996 Department of City and Regional Planning

Carolina Planning

A Student-Run Publication of
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Department of City and Regional Planning

Volume 21
Number 2

Keynote Address at the 39th Annual North Carolina Planning Conference and Robert and Helen Siler Lecture	Remarks by Neal R. Peirce March 29, 1996	2
Recognizing a SLAPP Suit and Understanding Its Consequences	Darrell F. Cook and Dwight H. Merriam	8
Atlanta and the Olympics: The Case for Comprehensive Planning	Leon S. Eplan	16
North Carolina Main Street Program at 15 Years: Giving Communities Hope for Their Downtowns	Rodney L. Swink	24
Greensboro's Enterprise Community Strategic Plan	Mike Cowhig	30
Residential Segregation in North Carolina	Lance Freeman	36
"Micro" Enterprise Development: Building Businesses from the Bottom Up	David E. Buchholz	43
The Streetscape Demonstration	Hugh Deaner and Francesca Turchi	50
The Undergraduate Planning Degree in North Carolina: East Carolina University and Appalachian State University	Wes Hankins and Garry Cooper	56
Teaching Kids About Planning	Steve Gurley	60

Keynote Address at the 39th Annual North Carolina Planning Conference and Robert and Helen Siler Lecture

Remarks by Neal R. Peirce, March 29, 1996

Of course I was immensely pleased when my old friend and colleague Bob Siler asked if I would be willing to give this address, the first in a series of what are to be regular Siler Lectures. My family and I lived across the street from Bob and Helen Siler in Washington for many years, enjoying many good times together. Bob and I even accompanied each other on the first big trip of American city planners to China in 1979. He always knew something of value about every city in America, and I am pleased that our relationship continues.

When Bob called, my first reaction was that I would talk about the two recent so-called "Peirce Reports," which my colleague Curtis Johnson and I have done in North Carolina. The first, entitled "Triangle Needs a New Vision for the '90s," was published by the Raleigh *News & Observer* in September 1993. The second, "Shaping A Shared Future," appeared in the Charlotte *Observer* early last autumn.

But then it struck me how odd it is to talk about urban regions in North Carolina. Back in the early 1970s, when I was preparing the North Carolina chapter of my book, *The Border South States*, the story was quite different. The narrative was not of sparkling cities on hills, or even great historic seaports, but of waves of hardy yeomen struggling to farm tobacco or being drawn into one-industry towns to make textiles or furniture.

While it was true that the cumulative population of North Carolina had grown so that it was almost a megastate (one of America's ten largest), it was also true that North Carolina had no really major metropolitan area. The urbanized area around Charlotte, the state's largest city, was smaller than the Nashville, Tennessee, or Richmond, Virginia areas. There were scattered urban pockets such as Charlotte, Greensboro, Winston-Salem, Raleigh, and Durham, and a long roster of smaller textile mill and furniture factory towns. The bottom line, I wrote, was that "North Carolina has industrialized without completely urbanizing."

Two decades have made a significant difference, most of all in the emergence of the state's two truly significant metropolitan regions: the Triangle region of Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill (and I suppose we need to include Cary), and Charlotte and its environs.

But has North Carolina adjusted mentally to being urban? I have my doubts. North Carolina policymakers, fearing rural poverty, have worked hard to promote education and economic activity in the small towns and rural counties, in a way assuming that the cities could be largely left alone. Instead of bolstering cities, North Carolina concerns itself with projects in rural areas (which I'm tempted to call boondoggles) such as the Global Transpark. The state has allowed the inner city of its capital, Raleigh, to deteriorate badly. If a manufacturer shows interest in the state, no one tries to steer him close to an urban center.

In a sense it has been a grandly successful policy. The general economy of the state's cities has remained healthy despite this benign neglect. The Triangle region experienced a sensational 34 percent growth rate in the last decade, with Wake County leading the state at 40.5 percent. From roughly 7 million people today, the state is projected to grow another half million in the next 20 years. The multi-county Charlotte region, already about 1.4 million people, should reach 1.8 million by 2010.

One could also say both regions have been very intelligent in transforming themselves into big-time

***Neal R. Peirce** is a syndicated columnist with the Wahington Post Writers Group.*

urban form. The idea of the Research Triangle Park, the region's economic engine, was original and demonstrably brilliant, offering corporations and research laboratories a parklike, prestigious place to settle and cul-de-sacked corporate homes on wooded sites, while getting rich through their tie-in to the facilities of world-renowned universities. At last count the park was responsible for 35,000 direct jobs, and probably several times as many spinoff jobs. As for Charlotte, the secret was written in the dollar signs of big finance. Its corporate chieftains ranged America in search of banks, capturing one big financial house after another and dragging their prizes back to Charlotte's Uptown, much like the hunters of old returning home with a bounty.

Physically, there's been a difference. The Triangle region was willing enough to grow low and close to the earth, but not Charlotte, which hired famed architects and created a signature skyline. Yet most of the population in the Charlotte region, as in the Triangle, has spread outward and outward. Like the Triangle, un-urban office development prospers around Charlotte. First Union, for example, has now added a massive back-office building close to the University of North Carolina at Charlotte (UNCC), that reminds you from the air of the Pentagon. In population per square mile, both the Triangle and Charlotte are among the more lightly settled metropolitan centers of America.

So what's wrong with this? Hasn't the Triangle has been rated, by many an outsider, as one of the best places to live and do business in the country? Isn't Charlotte practically the symbol of rapid and successful development? Let me answer that by asking a question: what will make for successful regions in the new world economy? Curtis Johnson and I tried to answer that question when we put together our 1993 book, *Citistates.*

Our thesis was fairly straightforward. We argued that great metropolitan regions have become the closely interrelated geographic, economic, and environmental entities that chiefly define late 20th-century civilization. Population is flowing toward them. They trade and compete directly with each other, with messages, data, and money transfers generated in citistate financial centers leaping national boundaries in real time, without pausing to ask permission. Measured electronically, the globe is approximately one half second wide. Trade barriers are crumbling and opening distant markets, making it much more difficult to subsidize and sustain politically favored regions. Immigration flows across borders with increasing ease. Finally, the end of the Cold War has dramatically reduced the importance of the one activity nation states were perhaps best at—amassing huge armies and preparing for war.

Curtis and I have developed a definition we would like Random House or Webster's to accept:

> **Citi•state** -- n. -- A region consisting of one or more historic central cities surrounded by cities and towns which have a shared identification, function as a single zone for trade, commerce and communication, and are characterized by social, economic and environmental interdependence.

Note that our definition does not mention borders, and for good reason. Citistates are not political inventions, they are *organic*. A citistate is what the economy does: how widely the city's newspapers circulate and television signals reach, a commute-shed, and a labor, health services, and educational market. The citistate is the pattern of lights you'd see flying in on a spaceship at night. Politicians may tell us these regions are separated, divided, differentiated political jurisdictions, but those lines are invisible from the air.

> Citistates are not political inventions, they are *organic*.

The Europeans freely describe their continent as a collection of increasingly powerful citistates, ranging from Milan to Hamburg, Manchester to Stuttgart, Lyon to Marseilles—all metropolitan regions making deals and establishing direct economic and cultural ties to each other with minimal regard for the nation states in which they happen to be located. Hong Kong, throwing its net of investment activity across Guangzhou Province and deep into the People's Republic of China, is the ultimate example of a citistate making even ferociously guarded national boundaries less and less relevant.

So, one could ask, are the Triangle and Charlotte regions ready to play in the international big leagues? Here is where my doubts and questions set in. The regions have the skills, with scientific capacity of the highest order in the Triangle, and in Charlotte such heavyweight financial capacity that one could imagine the bank executives, in their sky-scraping pyra-

mids some Monday morning, trying to decide if this is the week to buy Japan.

I have doubts which fall into three general areas: decision-making, social equity, and the environment and physical form. While most Northern and Midwestern cities have long since rejected the paradigm of a small group of white men meeting over starchy tablecloths to make decisions for everyone else, the legend holds on in North Carolina. The state appears to believe in strong man leaders; note it's almost invariably "man," not "woman." In the Triangle Region there is the history of Luther Hodges and other strong man allies giving birth to the Research Triangle Park. There is a yearning for that leadership power of yesteryear. For example, the new Regional Council even started out with the word "Leadership" in its title. Many in Charlotte believe the big bank presidents, such as Hugh McColl and Ed Crutchfield, can still decide virtually any civic or economic question. (I should note that McColl told me last year that the baton was being passed and that "the so-called group that people think controls everything downtown cratered about four or five years ago.") Crutchfield explains that the holdover belief of control by the few stems from the fact that many Charlotteans were born, like McColl and himself, in small towns which were "sort of one-horse towns were some rich guy controls the land and the buildings."

In matter of fact, power in modern American citistates is much too splintered for any group to exercise it very efficiently. Big corporations are often too preoccupied with the national or global scene to focus on localities, and their local branch managers keep changing anyway. Another factor is the rise of multiple new social, ethnic, and political groups. In Charlotte, for example, populist conservatives who were particularly suspicious of "Uptown power" sent yellow dog Democrats cowering in confusion by sweeping into victory in the 1994 elections. The city also recently rejected a large school bond. The Carolinas Partnership for Economic Growth, which crosses into South Carolina, and the Queen City Congress, which brings together affluent and poor neighborhoods to fight for their common interests, are other examples of newly formed organizations splintering the political landscape.

The challenge for both the Triangle and Charlotte regions today is to broaden decision-making so that enough people are involved to achieve consensus and action. To focus on that challenge, I'll pick an area that's controversial, consequential, and highly relevant to the interests of planners. That issue, of course, is physical form and growth.

For all the apparent success of the Carolina regions, they have done a less than stunning job in this area. The Triangle region, for example, is now stuck with the model set in the 1950s by the Research Triangle Park: a campus-like, wooded, low-density setting. Instead of funneling the growth, with higher densities, into the region's established city centers and neighborhoods, growth of the built environment was allowed to scatter outward. The region now suffers from severe suburban sprawl, threats to its lakes and water supply, longer commute times, pockets of ugly and mounting traffic congestion, and serious air quality problems. The counties are at each others' throats, fighting for industry to sustain their tax bases because new residential development doesn't pay for itself. Area leaders discuss mass transit, but as we noted in our 1993 report, "The soul of the Triangle Region is lying on the drafting tables of the state highway department, a.k.a. the North Carolina Department of Transportation," an organization known for its ultimate disdain for anything but laid concrete and asphalt.

Our wonderment in writing about the Triangle was that its highly educated people are not up in arms. They can see Interstate 40 and the Outer Loop creating a kind of Los Angeles on the Piedmont, with 10 or 12 one-way traffic lanes ultimately necessary as auto miles driven escalate far ahead of population increase. With their own eyes they can witness the dire results of inner city disinvestment. With their educations and backgrounds they understand what these changes mean, ecologically, socially, and physically. Among Triangle residents the planners and urbanists know the most, and earliest, about superior forms being developed elsewhere. That information, pushed vigorously into public debate, is critical for the region. Yet my impression is that the area's vast academic community does not often speak out on these critical issues. To me, it seems like a great lost opportunity and forgone responsibility.

I will be even more specific. Right now, across America, there is a dramatic increase in interest about regional issues, and an even stronger concern over the effect of sprawl. Consider a timely warning from Middle America. A recent *Kansas City Star* series alleges that sprawl "has spawned a virus eating us from the inside out . . . hollowed out the urban cores of America, feeding on racism and government handouts . . . incited a civil war among neighboring towns

fighting for business development . . . scattered us (as a civilization) like ashes to the wind."

Last year the Bank of America joined environmentalists to warn that "unchecked sprawl has shifted from an engine of California's growth to a force that threatens to inhibit growth and degrade [California's] quality of life." Anthony Pilla, Roman Catholic bishop of Cleveland and Northeast Ohio, preaches that sprawl to far suburbs divides people physically and spiritually, isolating the poor most egregiously. *The Chicago Tribune*, in its recent "Nation of Strangers" series, warns that the "hypermobility" of the suburban era—working, sleeping, playing, schooling at locations reached only by long auto rides—has broken down community, created sterile environments, and impoverished our national spirit.

As the *Tribune* notes, "[w]hat once were the country lanes of the outer reaches of Chicago, Houston, Philadelphia, Tampa, Los Angeles, and so many other American cities have become four-lane highways through a mercilessly franchised landscape," ranging from Arby's to Midas Muffler to Taco Bell.

As urbanists and planners you know that these are not the first warnings. As far back as 1928 and 1929 the New York Regional Plan Association called uncontrolled growth the greatest threat to the three-state New York-New Jersey-Connecticut metropolitan region. Officials failed to listen. Land was devoured 12 times faster than population growth. Suburbia became the region's growth engine.

In its 1996 report the association states the region's suburbs suffered as much as the cities through the 1989-92 recession. The myth of suburban economies' invincibility was shattered. Some of you may have noted that the federal Office of Technology, in a swan-song report just before going out of existence last autumn, announced that continued advances in technology will permit more and more development to spread, almost infinitely, across our landscapes. There is a great deal of conventional thinking to that effect. However, the New York Regional Plan Association finds the threat is not merely uncontrolled growth, but rather the resulting region-wide decline. Failing to use its land intelligently, to protect its watersheds, and to modernize its mass transit and other infrastructure, the fractured New York citistate is in peril of losing its global economic leadership to smart, investment-minded European and Asian regions. Here in the Southland, where people are always anxious to avoid New York's errors, the experience can be a very big warning for the future of this area.

Next we need to add the issue of character. Traditionally, we built our cities on grid systems, essentially "open" plans that invited social and income mixing. No longer. Now we let suburban cul-de-sac developers have their way, building "exclusive" developments with single roads connecting to a major highway. The town center, in walkable distance, gets lost. In place of homey collections of roses or vine-ripe tomatoes, cul-de-sacked America routinely offers shrubs set by professional landscapers in beds of gravel or bark chips to keep maintenance low. The front porch is replaced by garage door openings, and the front door sometimes virtually invisible. It's a cold, cold form.

> A child ought to be able to walk safely from home to buy a popsicle within five minutes.

Consider children. One of the great myths of our age is that suburbs are good for children. They aren't. Hal Box of the University of Texas School of Architecture notes that the child's world shrunk into the size of a few backyards, there being nothing to walk to other than more houses.

Who is to doubt we need a new humanism in town planning, attacking rigid zoning separation, reconnecting people with walkable communities? We need to remember Churchill's words, "[w]e shape our cities and then they shape us." Design does affect behavior. I was in Austin a couple of weeks ago for a day-long conference on New Urbanism with 650 local developers and planners. At the conference Professor Box suggested the test of new communities, or rebuilding old, should be the Five Minute Popsicle Rule: a child ought to be able to walk safely from home to buy a popsicle within five minutes.

Which brings us to the emerging and encouraging school of architectural and land use planning called "New Urbanism." The idea, in some respects, is quite sentimental. New Urbanism goes "back to the future" and builds neighborhoods the way they were before World War II: more compact, with houses and walk-up apartments on smaller, less sterile streets, places with real town centers and pedestrian-acces-

sible parks and gathering places. Southern Village in Chapel Hill is an actual experiment in New Urbanism, begun a year and a half ago by developer D.R. Bryan. Southern Village has small streets, alleys, neighborhood parks, detached housing with some townhouses, and a commons area with offices, multifamily units, and park and ride transit facilities.

Now Durham city and county are moving ahead with their 2020 Plan vision. The plan calls for a variety of distinct neighborhoods, emphasizing choice in where people may choose to live. The plan also designates compact corridors, including one toward the airport and Raleigh, a second along 15-501 toward Chapel Hill, and a third toward North Durham job centers. The hope is that compact neighborhoods in these corridors will include a mix of higher intensity, well-designed housing and employment centers, increasing pedestrian access and reducing auto dependence.

These are refreshing ideas and actions that had not surfaced when we did our study of the Triangle three years ago. One wishes Wake, Orange, and other counties in the area would do the same. Indeed, what the area really needs is a strong Triangle-wide commitment to a new land use and transportation future. Chuck Twardy, columnist for the *News & Observer,* spelled it out: "[a] regional planning agency with some muscle" would insure a better balance of areawide growth "so that Durham is not draining dollars at Raleigh's expense, so that Cary cannot build in Raleigh and Garner's next drinking water source, so that areas in the midst of the Triangle are carefully developed with mixed-use, mixed-income communities." To that I would add combining the area's metropolitan planning organizations in order to look at highways, mass transit, and intermodal potentials on a rational, region-wide basis. Today Wake and Durham Counties are in different Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO), which is sheer insanity when one thinks of true citistate form.

But how does one force the official system to act? Only, it seems to me, with strong citizen organization pushing incessantly. In the last years the Triangle region has had several broad-gauged assemblies and World Class Region convocations; almost 1,000 attended one conference in 1992. In a poll of the attendees, 85 percent said regional growth and land use management required priority attention. The following year a Greater Triangle Regional Council was formed. Today it has a major project, "Examining Regional Development Choices" which is based on the expectation that the region will grow from 1 million people today to 1.5 million in 20 years. Smedes York, who is sparking the regional effort, supplied me with recent surveys of what members of the Council value most in the region. Predictably, pride in research and higher education and the reputation for "knowledge workers" rated very high. But so too did open spaces and natural areas like the Neuse River and Duke Forest, along with the distinctive identities and physical forms of the region's varied communities.

What members of the Regional Council felt most in need of change was also interesting. First was the lack of adequate public transportation. Second, less "political balkanization" and finding a greater "regional attitude." Then came equality in education, deterioration of center city areas, and addressing sprawl and racial divisiveness. So far so good. What seems of concern is that citizen activity to force change on reluctant local governments and legislators is not happening. People in the Triangle area continue to believe that leaders, now assembled in the Regional Council, can make change. The politics of the 1990s does not work that way. You need shock troops who are armed with the best data and state-of-the-art knowledge and techniques, all of which should be supplied by the universities.

Smedes York, incidentally, has a wonderful way of describing the contrasting cultures of the two big Carolina regions: Charlotte is organized like a corporation, the Triangle like a university. Each place needs to learn to change by exploiting its strengths.

In our Charlotte report last year, we said it was time to democratize development, to put ordinary citizens in position to review, comment on and shape development. Charlotteans, descendants of thrifty, self-sufficient pioneers, never trusted authority and rejected government planning controls. In their nearly theological brand of individualism, they thought they were in charge. They weren't. Growth was controlled, not by the people, but by the highway engineers, developers, and builders. The result now appears in several ways: strip-signed highways like Independence Boulevard, which are among America's ugliest; acres of urban devastation in and around central Charlotte; a cancer of abandonment creeping beyond the center city, and a lack of buildings, squares, and public places to which people feel any loyalty.

Yet the Charlotte region has something lacking in the Triangle: a coherent, multi-county image of where it might go. The author of this image is Michael Gallis, a private planner who tirelessly explains how Charlotte can and should focus development along

the natural corridors radiating from the center city and linking to Rock Hill, Gastonia, Monroe, Kannapolis, and other cities in a 20-mile radius around the central city. Indeed, Gallis helped Rock Hill focus on its own identity and strengths by simultaneously identifying and celebrating itself as a leading satellite city of Charlotte. Rock Hill's promotional folders even show the Charlotte skyline on the horizon. (Express buses, incidentally, now speed between Rock Hill and downtown Charlotte.)

But while Charlotte recognizes its interdependence with its ring cities, it too needs citizens to be catalysts for real change. Right now there is talk of having organizations like the Queen City Congress and the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Citizens Forum be powerful voices of the regional citizenry.

One way planning can be democratized, as we said in our Charlotte report, would be to open a special center at UNCC. The center would let citizens use sophisticated computer technology to illustrate real choices on how roads might be routed, town centers constructed, and residential areas built out. Developers would first have to take their proposals to the center for public debate. Their argument, we know, is that people will only buy standard spread-out subdivisions with their huge setbacks, big garage doors, and all the rest. Our bet is that if you show computerized alternatives of a denser mix with parks, restored front porches, and cars pushed to alleys and back garages, people will accept far more density than they might tell you at first. The feared NIMBYism against any and all development will fade as people have full information and feel closer to the decision-making process.

Efforts are now underway to set up that center for computer simulation at UNCC, with the hope that all parties, including local governments, businesses, and neighborhood groups, could take advantage of it. The Triangle area should consider the same idea at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill or one of its sister Triangle institutions. I believe such a center would encapsulate the critical means for progress today. These means involve professionals making a vital contribution, not just because they know best and everybody should be heeding them, but because they work with citizens, refining their own insights through citizens' input, and ultimately their influence flows through their partnerships with citizens.

When I think about regionalism and the question of successful citistates, I see vital issues of competence, cohesiveness, economic efficiency, reinvented government, and social equity all rolled into one. There is a new paradigm for us to focus on. It differs from the old paradigm we know so well and have worked with so long of looking to federal, state, and then local government for the lion's share of our answers.

The new paradigm is global, regional, and neighborhood:

- Global, because critical environmental impacts can be worldwide, in addition to worldwide economic restructuring as it tears apart our comfortable relationships.

- Regional, because citistates are the true cities of our time, the real environmental basins, labor markets, and functioning economic communities, and call out for regional planning.

- And neighborhood, because the local community is the arena which ultimately must deal with America's grave and growing social problems.

We must look within neighborhoods to build strength, to stop the erosion of social resilience, and to find the lost social contract. We must recognize, recultivate, and reinvigorate our civic order, our informal network of family, friends, neighborhood associations, clubs, civic groups, local businesses, and churches and turn to neighborhood people of all economic classes to take civic leadership, to be personally concerned with the issues in the streets, parks, and shared spaces they call home. Although planners and architects can think up the popsicle rule, it will take neighborhood people to make it happen. CP

Recognizing a SLAPP Suit and Understanding Its Consequences

Darrell F. Cook and Dwight H. Merriam

A pesky environmental group is constantly hampering your development plans. The group is fiercely opposed to your project and has attempted to thwart your efforts. On many occasions, the group has expressed its concerns to the local zoning authority. It challenges every permit you seek and went so far as to submit scathing editorials to the local paper. These efforts have delayed your project, cost you serious money, and are making your life miserable.

You believe that the group's concerns are mostly unfounded, and you are convinced it has given inaccurate information about the environmental impacts. If you could make this mob disappear, you are certain that the project would proceed without further delay.

You are now considering taking the group to court, and a local lawyer is eager to file a multi-million dollar lawsuit for you. The opposition group has limited resources, and you think the threat of costly and protracted litigation will make the group abandon its tactics. Will filing a lawsuit be the answer to your problems, or will it result in even greater difficulties? This article will help a developer in this situation answer the question.

***Darrell Cook** and **Dwight Merriam**, AICP, are members of Robinson & Cole's Land Use Group, which Merriam chairs. Darrell Cook is a graduate of the University of Maryland and a former judicial clerk for the Court of Appeals of Maryland. Dwight Merriam is a graduate of the Department of City and Regional Planning at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Past President of the American Institute of Certified Planners.*

Defining a "SLAPP" Suit

Should our developer file a lawsuit against the environmental group, the term "SLAPP" will undoubtedly pop up on the screen. The acronym was coined by Professors George W. Pring and Penelope Canan for a "Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation."[1] According to Professors Pring and Canan, a SLAPP suit consists of the following four elements:

1. a civil complaint or counterclaim for monetary damages and/or an injunction;
2. filed against non-governmental individuals or groups;
3. because of their communication to a governmental body, official, or the electorate;
4. on an issue of some public interest or concern.[2]

To fully characterize a SLAPP, however, a fifth criterion is necessary: "the suits are without merit and contain an ulterior political or economic motive."[3]

The paradigm SLAPP suit is an action filed by a land developer against environmental activists or neighbors who object to the proposed development. As in the introductory example, a citizen group may express environmental concerns to a local zoning authority, delaying or killing a project. The developer then sues the group in retaliation for, on average, $9 million in damages.[4] Even though the lawsuit is without merit, the developer hopes that the general unpleasantness of litigation, its high costs, and the potential, no matter how remote, of a multi-

million dollar judgment will stifle the group's opposition to the development project.

Even using the forgoing five-part definition, SLAPP suits can be difficult to identify. They are disguised under a variety of traditional legal theories, the most frequent of which are defamation and business torts such as interference with contract or advantageous relations. Abuse of process, malicious prosecution, and conspiracy also serve to camouflage SLAPP suits.[5] They are indeed the "Where's Waldo?" of land-use litigation.

The Impact of SLAPP Suits

The First Amendment to the United States Constitution grants citizens the right to petition the government for a redress of their grievances.[6] This right has been characterized as one of "the most precious of the liberties safeguarded by the Bill of Rights."[7] As aptly explained by one state supreme court,

> "[c]itizen access to the institutions of government constitutes one of the foundations upon which our republican form of government is premised. In a representative democracy government acts on behalf of the people, and effective representation depends to a large extent upon the ability of the people to make their wishes known to governmental officials acting on their behalf."[8]

Because SLAPP suits seek to punish citizens for communicating with governmental bodies, they deter citizens from exercising this important right. This silencing effect has caused the SLAPP phenomenon to be criticized as "one of the most troubling legal trends in our country."[9]

By deterring the exercise of constitutional rights, SLAPP suits detract from balanced input on important governmental decisions. City planners depend largely on the testimony of developers, citizen groups, and other interested individuals in making land-use planning decisions. When SLAPP suits discourage testimony from citizen groups, planning decisions may become unbalanced and distinctly one-sided in favor of development. In light of these effects, judges and lawmakers have expressed great concern over the SLAPP suit.

Judicial Responses to SLAPP Suits

Besides the public-relations nightmare that may accompany a SLAPP suit, the lawsuit will likely face close judicial scrutiny.[10] The Supreme Court of Colorado's innovative decision in *Protect Our Mountain Environment, Inc. (POME) v. District Court of County of Jefferson*[11] is indicative of this close scrutiny. *POME* requires the trial court to employ a heightened standard of review when a SLAPP-suit defendant (our opposition group) raises the First Amendment petition clause as a defense. In addition to the stricter review standard, *POME* also requires the plaintiff (our developer) to demonstrate the following in order to survive a motion to dismiss:

1. The defendant's statements or actions are devoid of factual or legal merit;

2. The statements or actions are primarily intended to harass the plaintiff or to effectuate some other improper objective; and

3. The statements or actions could adversely affect a legal interest of the plaintiff.[12]

Another state judge proposed that a plaintiff should have to plead more specific allegations than otherwise would be required where the conduct underlying a lawsuit is *prima facie* protected by the petition clause of the First Amendment.[13]

Even if the SLAPP suit plaintiff can overcome these initial hurdles, defendants almost always have adequate defenses to the plaintiff's claims. Defamation, the most common tort alleged in a SLAPP suit, is defined as a false written or oral statement that tends to injure the plaintiff's reputation "so as to lower him in the estimation of the community or to deter third persons from associating or dealing with him."[14] A SLAPP suit plaintiff may have a difficult time prevailing on a defamation claim because pure opinions are excluded from the scope of the tort.[15] Even if the defendants' statements or comments are false, they may still prevail. Plaintiffs who are public figures must prove with "convincing clarity" that the defendant acted with actual malice—with knowledge that the statements were false or were made with reckless disregard of their truth.[16] In the SLAPP suit context, land-use developers involved in public approval processes such as rezoning and permit applications have attained the status of public figures in the view of some courts.[17]

Defendants likewise have ready defenses to other typical SLAPP suit claims such as interference with contract and other business torts. To dismiss these claims, courts often rely on the constitutional right to petition and the associated *Noerr-Pennington* doctrine. The *Noerr-Pennington* doctrine originated in a trio of federal anti-trust cases as a rule of statutory construction, designed to avoid clashes between the Sherman Anti-Trust Act and First Amendment petitioning rights.[18] The doctrine has since been expanded beyond its anti-trust origins to protect petitioning from other causes of action. Reduced to its essentials, *Noerr-Pennington* insulates non-"sham" petitioning activities from all liability whatsoever.[19]

In addition to the strong likelihood of losing the merits of a SLAPP suit, the filer faces court-imposed sanctions. Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and many state counterparts impose a duty on attorneys to certify that they have conducted a reasonable inquiry before filing suit. The attorney must have determined that any papers filed with the court are well grounded in fact and law, and not imposed for an improper purpose such as "to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of litigation."[20] The court may either on its own initiative, or at the request of the SLAPP suit defendant, move to sanction an attorney for violating this rule.

North Carolina courts have this authority pursuant to N.C. Gen. Stat. §1A-1, Rule 11. A violation of the rule requires the court to impose an "appropriate sanction," and it may be imposed against the attorney, the represented party, or both. Sanctions may include an order that the party violating the rule pay the reasonable attorneys' fees incurred by the other party as a result of the baseless pleading or paper. Under the so-called "American Rule," in nearly all cases, litigants pay their own legal bills, whether they win or lose. Shifting the financial burden can be a powerful sanction.

Perhaps the most significant consequence of filing a SLAPP suit is the risk of being SLAPPed-Back. The victim of a SLAPP suit may turn around and sue the SLAPP-suit plaintiff for abuse of process, malicious prosecution, violation of constitutional rights, or violation of civil rights statutes. SLAPP-Backs, unlike SLAPP suits, have fared quite well in court, and have resulted in generous verdicts as high as $11.1 and $13 million.[21]

As reported in a St. Louis, Missouri newspaper, a recent SLAPP-Back resulted in a $2.65 million verdict against a St. Louis developer.[22] In 1980, approximately one year after Carl and Rita Fust moved into their new home, the developer unveiled plans for a commercial development that would abut the Fusts' property. Unhappy with this prospect, Rita Fust organized a petition drive, and the County Council voted against the project.

In the mid-1980s, the developer obtained approval for, and subsequently built, a scaled-down project that the Fusts didn't oppose. In January of 1990, however, the developer started building a fence to separate his property from the Fusts and other neighbors. Concerned that the fence would be aesthetically unpleasing and that workers might trespass on his property, Mr. Fust wrote a letter to the developer, and sent copies to his neighbors and a county councilman.

Perhaps the most significant consequence of filing a SLAPP suit is the risk of being SLAPPed-Back.

The developer then sued Mr. Fust for $1 million, alleging that he was libeled in the letter. The developer offered to drop the lawsuit if the Fusts agreed not to interfere with any zoning requests, to apologize for the fence letter, and to fork over $25,000. When Mr. Fust refused, the developer responded by adding Mrs. Fust to the lawsuit. The Fusts hired their own lawyer, and the developer's lawsuit was dismissed in 1992. Three months later, the Fusts sued the developer for abuse of process and malicious prosecution.

The developer declined to attend the trial or testify, so portions of his deposition testimony were read to the jury. When asked why he thought his lawsuit was worth $1 million, he explained that the Fusts had fought the development from day one, that they constantly called the county, and that they organized a petition. The Fusts were awarded $2.65 million in damages.

It is easy to agree with Professors Pring's and Canan's observation that "SLAPPs, as lawsuits go, are losers."[23] They are "losers" not only in the sense that the defendant will likely prevail on the merits,

but also because the filer risks adverse publicity, possible sanctions, and a large SLAPP-Back verdict.

This is not to say, however, that developers are not mistreated or that they do not have any recourse. They are and they do. In a recent Massachusetts case, a developer plaintiff filed suit against a group of homeowners for defamation and intentional interference with contractual and advantageous relations.[24] The corporate plaintiff alleged that the defendant homeowners constantly "badmouthed" it. The plaintiff also accused the homeowners of advertising their houses for sale, not because they planned on selling, but to discourage potential sales in the development. The homeowners characterized the lawsuit as a SLAPP, and moved to dismiss it on the basis that their actions were protected. The court, however, denied the motion. In the court's opinion, the homeowners' conduct, if proven, was not protected petitioning or speech—rather, it amounted to "economic coercion" to force the developer to convert a common drive into a public street.[25]

The real problem is in navigating the foggy waters just offshore of the shoals of SLAPP. When is a lawsuit a means to proper redress and when is it a tool of intimidation?

Legislative Responses to SLAPP Suits

The SLAPP problem has recently received a great deal of attention by state legislatures.[26] In an effort to reduce the number of SLAPP suits, legislation has been enacted in a significant number of states,[27] and introduced in a number of others.[28] One citizen group has even proposed federal legislation addressing the problem of SLAPPs.[29]

The typical anti-SLAPP statute affords the victim a speedy means of dismissing the lawsuit, and awards the victim its costs and attorneys' fees upon dismissal. Recent decisions addressing legislation in California, Massachusetts, and New York illustrate the scope of anti-SLAPP legislation and the difficulties that arise when legislating in a complex area such as SLAPPs.

California

In 1992, California enacted legislation establishing a special motion to strike lawsuits that are based upon a defendant's exercise of the right of petition or free speech in connection with a public issue.[30] To withstand the motion, the plaintiff must show a "probability" of prevailing on the claim. In making this determination, the court considers the pleadings, and supporting and opposing affidavits stating the facts upon which the liability or defense is based. If the plaintiff fails to meet this burden, the lawsuit is dismissed, and the defendant is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

When is a lawsuit a means to proper redress and when is it a tool of intimidation?

Several decisions have addressed the scope of the California anti-SLAPP statute, the most important of which is *Wilcox v. Superior Court*.[31] In that case, the court clarified certain aspects of the statute. First, the SLAPP-suit defendant has the *prima facie* burden of showing that the statute applies. This requires the defendant to show that he or she has been sued based upon a written or oral statement made (1) before a governmental proceeding or official; (2) in connection with an issue under consideration or review by a governmental body or official; or (3) in a place open to the public or a public forum in connection with an issue of public interest.

Second, *Wilcox* clarified that the court may use affidavits only to examine the true nature of a plaintiff's claims. Thus, a SLAPP-suit defendant may submit affidavits to explain that what appears on the face of a complaint to be a claim for defamation or interference with business advantage is in reality a blatant attack on protected petitioning activity. The court may not weigh competing affidavits to resolve factual disputes in determining the probability of the plaintiff's success in the lawsuit. By using affidavits only to show the context and background that may be absent from the face of the complaint, rather than to decide a factual issue that would otherwise be resolved by the jury, the court does not deprive the defendant of the right to a jury trial.

Wilcox's limitation on the use of affidavits and pleadings avoids a problem that prevented the enactment of New Hampshire anti-SLAPP legislation in 1994. In *Opinion of the Justices (SLAPP Suit Proce-*

dure),[32] the Supreme Court of New Hampshire rendered an advisory opinion that a New Hampshire Senate Bill, modelled after California's anti-SLAPP statute, would be unconstitutional if enacted. Focusing on the statutory language requiring the court to consider the pleadings, and supporting and opposing affidavits, the New Hampshire court explained that weighing the pleadings and affidavits to determine a "probability" of success would deny a defendant's right to have all factual questions resolved by the jury.

Another interesting decision addressing the California statute is *Ludwig v. Superior Court*.[33] In *Ludwig*, the court held that a developer's efforts to impede a mall project were within the scope of the statute. (That's not a mistake—a developer's efforts to stop development.) The defendant developer had supported and encouraged others to speak out against the plaintiff developer at public hearings.

In light of the environmental effects associated with the development of a mall, including increased traffic and impacts on natural drainage, the court concluded that the competing developer's actions concerned a matter of public interest, and thus were within the scope of the statute. The court rejected the plaintiff's argument that the statute was inapplicable because the defendant merely encouraged others to speak out, but did not directly communicate with a governmental authority. Because the statute applied, the plaintiff was required to show a probability of success on the merits in order to survive the special motion to dismiss.[34]

Massachusetts

Enacted in 1994 over the governor's veto, Massachusetts anti-SLAPP statute is applicable when a party has been sued based upon the "exercise of its right of petition" under either the United States or Massachusetts constitution.[35] The phrase "exercise of its right of petition" is broadly defined under the statute, and encompasses any written or oral statement:

1. Made before or submitted to a governmental body or proceeding;

2. Made in connection with an issue under consideration or review by a governmental body or proceeding;

3. Reasonably likely to encourage consideration or review of an issue by a governmental body or proceeding;

4. Reasonably likely to enlist public participation in an effort to effect such consideration; or

5. Otherwise falling within constitutional protection of the right to petition government.

Pursuant to the Massachusetts statute, a party who has allegedly been SLAPPed may file a "special motion to dismiss," which requires the non-moving party to show that the moving party's exercise of its right to petition was "devoid of any reasonable factual support or any arguable basis in law," and that the moving party's actions caused actual injury to the responding party. The statute limits discovery once the motion to dismiss has been filed, and mandates the award of costs and attorneys' fees if the moving party prevails.

Less than a year after its enactment, the statute has been successfully invoked on several occasions. In *Thomson v. Town of Andover Board of Appeals*,[36] a trial judge granted a special motion to dismiss a defamation counterclaim where the plaintiffs challenged the issuance of a special zoning permit, and their letters regarding the zoning dispute were published in *The Boston Globe*. A judge also granted a special motion to dismiss in *Jordan v. Murray*,[37] where the plaintiff developer sued an individual for defamation and tortious interference claims. The defendant in *Jordan* sought to determine through letters and petitions to an administrative agency whether the plaintiff was in compliance with wetlands requirements. The plaintiff's lawsuit was premised on these efforts, as well as allegedly untrue statements made by the defendant to his neighbors regarding the development.

Of particular significance to developers is the recent "badmouthing" decision, "the first in favor of a developer under the new statute."[38] In *Wigwam Associates, Inc. v. McBride*,[39] the trial court denied a special motion to dismiss because the alleged statements and conduct of the defendants were "made and performed outside the context of petitioning the government."[40] The defendants had unsuccessfully petitioned the government to force the plaintiff developer to convert a private common drive into a public street. Rather than give up, the defendants continuously "badmouthed" the developer to potential buyers, and they put "for sale" signs on their lawns, not to advertise actual availability, but to discourage potential sales. Assuming the truth of the developer's

allegations for purposes of the motion to dismiss, the judge concluded that the defendants' actions were taken to drive the developer out of business or to compel him to modify the common drive, and thus did not fall within the scope of the Massachusetts statute.

The fact pattern in *Wigwam* parallels a recent dispute in Maryland. In what has been described as a "threat to SLAPP," a builder threatened to sue residents that picketed and placed for-sale signs on their property to protest the lack of parking spaces in their townhouse community.[41] Although a lawsuit premised on the residents' picketing activities raises serious constitutional questions, the residents' use of the "for sale" signs is more suspect. Assuming the residents had no intention of selling their properties, and were merely using the signs as part of a coordinated effort to cause economic harm to the builder and to drive him to the bargaining table, this conduct would not be protected as in *Wigwam*.

Rushing into a lawsuit may be the last thing the developer should do.

Traindafilou v. Kravchuk[42] is also worthy of note. In that case, the corporate defendant sought to expand its shopping center. The corporate plaintiff, the owner of a neighboring shopping center, objected to the expansion plans, and filed suit alleging that the defendant failed to comply with applicable zoning regulations. In retaliation, the defendant filed a counterclaim for improper interference with contractual relations. The plaintiff then moved to dismiss the counterclaim under Massachusetts' anti-SLAPP statute, but the judge denied the motion in an unwritten bench ruling, apparently on the grounds that the statute only protected individuals.

The Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts accepted the case on its own motion, and will address whether Massachusetts' anti-SLAPP statute applies to a lawsuit between competing corporate developers. The court must decide whether, as advanced by the plaintiff, the statute's plain language applies to the counterclaim as the language is not limited to individuals, or whether the defendant correctly contends that the legislature intended the statute only to apply to citizens engaged in public debate, but not to a company acting for private profit. It will be interesting to see whether the Massachusetts court limits the scope of the statute to individuals, or holds that it applies to competing developers as did the *Ludwig v. Superior Court* decision in addressing the scope of the California statute.

New York

In 1992, New York also enacted legislation to combat the problem of SLAPPs. The New York statute establishes a cause of action against the filer of a SLAPP suit that is "materially related to any efforts of the defendant to report on, comment on, rule on, challenge or oppose such application or permission."[43] The cause of action benefits a SLAPP suit defendant if the plaintiff is a "person who has applied for or obtained a permit, zoning change, lease, license, certificate or other entitlement for use or permission to act from any government body, or any person with an interest, connection or affiliation with such [a] person that is materially related to such application or permission."[44] In such a case, the defendant may sue the plaintiff for damages, costs, and attorneys' fees.

In addition to establishing a cause of action on behalf of the SLAPP suit defendant, the legislature also enabled the defendant to obtain early dismissal of the SLAPP suit unless the plaintiff can demonstrate that the "cause of action has a substantial basis in fact and law or is supported by a substantial argument for an extension, modification, or reversal of existing law."[45] By requiring a "substantial basis," the New York statute places a greater burden on the filer of the SLAPP suit than do other state statutes. Nevertheless, a New York court is not required to award costs and attorneys' fees when the SLAPP suit plaintiff fails to meet this burden. Unlike California and Massachusetts, an award of costs and fees is discretionary in New York, not mandatory.[46]

Conclusions

Even though the developer's legal counsel in the introductory hypothetical is eager to file suit against the environmental group, this article should cause the developer to "stop and think" before giving his attorney the go ahead. Rushing into a lawsuit may be the last thing the developer should do. Although the developer considers the editorials "scathing," do they contain false information or mere opinions? Even if the information is false, might the developer be con-

sidered a public figure, and, if so, does he believe that the group acted with actual malice? Is the developer's motive in filing a lawsuit to punish the group for exercising its constitutional right to communicate with the local zoning authority, and to silence it from further communications? Does the governing jurisdiction have an anti-SLAPP statute or a sanctions rule? The developer should discuss all of these issues with his attorney before proceeding with a lawsuit.

Many articles have been written on SLAPP suits, and this article has not attempted to reiterate their content.[47] It will have served its purpose if the reader has a basic understanding of SLAPP suits, their social impact, and judicial and legislative responses to the SLAPP suit phenomenon. By understanding the concept of SLAPP suits, the reader will hopefully avoid their costly consequences. CP

Endnotes

1. *See* George W. Pring & Penelope Canan, *"Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation" ("SLAPPs"): An Introduction for Bench, Bar, and Bystanders*, 12 U. Bridgeport L. Rev. 937, 939 (1992).
2. *See id.* at 946-47.
3. Jeffrey A. Benson & Dwight H. Merriam, *Identifying and Beating a Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation*, 3 Duke Envtl. L. & Pol'y F. 17, 18 (1993).
4. *See* Alice Glover & Marcus Jimison, *S.L.A.P.P. Suits: A First Amendment Issue and Beyond*, 21 N.C. Cent. L.J. 122, 132 (1995).
5. For a more detailed discussion of typical SLAPP-suit claims, see Benson & Merriam, *supra* note 3, at 19-20.
6. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." U.S. Const. amend. I.
7. United Mine Workers v. Illinois State Bar Ass'n, 389 U.S. 217, 222, 88 S. Ct. 353, 356, 19 L. Ed. 2d 426, 430 (1967).
8. Protect Our Mountain Environment, Inc. v. District Court of County of Jefferson, 677 P.2d 1361, 1364 (Colo. 1984).
9. Glover & Jimison, *supra* note 4, at 135 (quoting Jeffrey A. Benson & Dwight H. Merriam, *Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation (SLAPPs): An Overview*, C750 A.L.I. - A.B.A. 837, 840 (1992)).
10. *See, e.g.*, Gordon v. Marrone, 155 Misc. 2d 726, 736, 590 N.Y.S.2d 649, 656 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 1992) ("Short of a gun to the head, a greater threat to First Amendment expression can scarcely be imagined."), *aff'd*, 202 A.D.2d 104, 616 N.Y.S.2d 98 (N.Y. App. Div. 1994); Westfield Partners, Ltd. v. Hogan, 740 F. Supp. 523, 525 (N.D. Ill. 1990) (viewing a SLAPP suit "with a great deal of skepticism").
11. 677 P.2d 1361 (Colo. 1984).
12. *Id.* at 1368-9.
13. *See* Webb v. Fury, 167 W. Va. 434, 466-69, 282 S.E.2d 28, 46-48 (W. Va. 1981) (Neely, J., dissenting).
14. W. Page Keeton et al., Prosser and Keeton on the Law of Torts § 111, at 774 (5th ed. 1984). "Defamation is made up of the twin torts of libel and slander — the one being, in general, written while the other in general is oral" *Id.* at 771.
15. *See* Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co., 497 U.S. 1, 13-14 (1990).
16. New York Times Co. v. Sullivan, 376 U.S. 254, 279-80, 285-86 (1964).
17. *See* Greenbelt Coop. Publishing Ass'n v. Bresler, 398 U.S. 6, 8-9 (1970); Mount Juneau Enters. Inc. v. Juneau Empire, 891 P.2d 829, 837 (Alaska 1995); Walters v. Linhof, 559 F. Supp. 1231, 1235 (D. Colo. 1983); Okun v. Superior Court of Los Angeles, 629 P.2d 1369, 1374 (Cal.), *cert. denied*, 454 U.S. 1099 (1981).
18. *See* California Motor Transport Co. v. Trucking Unlimited, 404 U.S. 508 (1972); United Mine Workers v. Pennington, 381 U.S. 657 (1965); Eastern Railroad President's Conference v. Noerr Motor, 365 U.S. 127 (1961).
19. The United States Supreme Court reviewed the *Noerr-Pennington* doctrine in *Professional Real Estate Investors, Inc. v. Columbia Pictures Indus., Inc.*, 113 S. Ct. 1920 (1993) ("*PRE*") as it applies to litigation. Just as citizens communicate with administrative bodies by appearing at public hearings and speaking out on issues of public concern, citizens petition the courts through the use of lawsuits. The *PRE* Court held that "an objectively reasonable effort to litigate cannot be a sham regardless of subjective intent." *Id.* at 1926.
20. Fed. R. Civ. P. 11.
21. *See* Benson & Merriam, *supra* note 3, at 28-29 (describing a successful California SLAPP-Back brought by farmers against an agribusiness); Glover & Jimison, *supra* note 4, at 132.
22. *See* William C. Lhotka, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, April 24, 1994, at 1A.
23. Pring & Canan, *supra* note 1, at 944.
24. Massachusetts Lawyers Weekly, October 30, 1995, at 1 (discussing the unreported decision of *Wigwam Associates, Inc. v. McBride*).

25. The "badmouthing" case is discussed *infra* in addressing Massachusetts' legislative response to SLAPP suits.
26. *See, e.g,* S.J. Res. 85, 42d Leg., 1st Sess., 1995 N.M. Laws (requesting "the Attorney General to study and make recommendations regarding strategic lawsuits against public participation"); Neb. Rev. Stat. § 25-21,241 (1994) (acknowledging a "disturbing increase" in SLAPPs).
27. *See, e.g.,* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 425.16 (1995); Mass. Ann. Laws ch. 231, § 59H (1995); Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 25-21,241-246 (1995); R.I. Gen. Laws §§ 9-33-2, 9-33-3 (1995); Wash. Rev. Code. §§ 4.24.510, 4.24.520 (1995).
28. States in which SLAPP legislation has been proposed, introduced, or studied include Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, New Hampshire, New Mexico, and Tennessee.
29. Judith Evans, The Washington Post, December 16, 1995, at E01.
30. Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 425.16 (1995).
31. 27 Cal. App. 4th 809, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 446 (Cal. Ct. App. 1994).
32. 138 N.H. 445, 641 A.2d 1012 (N.H. 1994).
33. 37 Cal. App. 4th 8, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 350 (Cal. Ct. App. 1995).
34. For an excellent synopsis of recent litigation relating to the California anti-SLAPP statute, including a discussion of the *Wilcox* and *Ludwig* decisions, see Michael D. Stokes, *The SLAPP Statute: A Three-Year Retrospective on a Constitutional Experiment*, 17 Civ. Lit. Rptr. 411 (1995).
35. Mass. Ann. Laws ch. 231, § 59H (1995).
36. Massachusetts Lawyers Weekly, August 7, 1995, at 21.
37. Massachusetts Lawyers Weekly, August 14, 1995, at 21.
38. Massachusetts Lawyers Weekly, October 30, 1995, at 1.
39. *Id.* at 12.
40. *Id.*
41. *See supra* note 29.
42. Massachusetts Lawyers Weekly, November 6, 1995, at 1 (reporting the unwritten bench ruling).
43. N.Y. Civ. Rights §§ 70-a, 76-a (1995).
44. *Id.*
45. N.Y. Civ. Prac. L. & R. §§ 3211(g), 3212(h) (1995).
46. *See* West Branch Conservation Ass'n v. Planning Bd. of Clarkstown, 1995 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 12796 (N.Y. App. Div. December 11, 1995).
47. For a more detailed treatment of SLAPP suits, the authors suggest the reader consult Benson & Merriam, *supra* note 3; Glover & Jimison, *supra* note 4; and Symposium, *Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation (SLAPP Suits)*, 12 U. Bridgeport L. Rev. 937 (1992).

Atlanta and the Olympics: The Case for Comprehensive Planning

Leon S. Eplan

In a matter of a few weeks, the City of Atlanta will host the 1996 Summer Olympic Games. This will be only the fourth time since the modern Olympiad movement was launched that the event has been held in an American city. St. Louis held the competition in 1904, and Los Angeles was host in 1932 and 1984.

Large-scale events such as the Olympics, world's fairs, and international exhibitions and festivals often have a lasting impact on a city. As such, they are of special interest to urban planners. For example, the Chicago World's Fair of 1893 significantly shaped the future of that city, as did gatherings in Seattle and St. Louis. On the other hand, Los Angeles has not been greatly affected by its two Olympic events.

Atlanta determined at the outset that it would use the event to prepare itself for the roles it seeks to play in the 21st century. In a July 1992 publication entitled *Atlanta's Olympic Development Program*, the city presented its program for preparing itself for the event to the meeting of the International Olympic Committee in Barcelona, spelling out the projects it would undertake set within a framework of its vision of a 21st century metropolis. Over the past four years, the city has endeavored to implement this program. Now, after years of feverish efforts, it is assured that when the Olympics end on August 4, Atlanta will be a significantly changed community. More importantly, the changes undertaken will direct the city towards its chosen future. The way Atlanta set out to use the Olympics to shape its future provides a rare opportunity for examining how the techniques and practices of urban planning can be applied to a mature city to successfully achieve a long-term vision.

Leon Eplan, *AICP, is Atlanta's Commissioner of Planning and Development. He is a former Director of the Graduate Planning Program at Georgia Tech and served as President of the American Institute of Planners. He received a Master of Regional Planning from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1953.*

Recent Development Trends in Atlanta

To understand how Atlanta has used planning to direct its future requires some knowledge of Atlanta's recent development history as well as the nature and characteristics of the Olympic event itself. During the latter half of this century, Atlanta emerged as a nationally important urban region. Its population expanded rapidly during this period, growing from fewer than a million persons in 1950 to almost three times that size today. During the present decade, growth has accelerated. The Atlanta area has become the nation's fastest growing large region, adding over 165,000 jobs during 1994 and 1995.

As in most regions of the country, population growth in the Atlanta region during the 1970s and 1980s occurred almost exclusively in the suburbs. New housing and centers of commerce and industry—the familiar "edge cities"—sprawled outward. What distinguished Atlanta in this period, however, was the difference in growth rates between the city and the surrounding area. While the region added a population of one million persons over the 20 years, the City of Atlanta lost 80,000 of its residents, a decline of 16 percent. In no other large and rapidly growing region did the central city lose such a large proportion of its inhabitants. Whereas over 37 percent of the region's population lived in the city in 1950, less than 15 percent resided in the central city by1990.

Perhaps more significant than the demographic shifts were the changes in the area's economy and

social fabric. The loss of city residents was accompanied by a drain of investments, greatly weakening the city's economy, tax base, and ability to deal effectively with an aging infrastructure. All of this was also taking place during a period when federal funds for improvements and reinvestment in the physical and natural environment were diminishing. At the same time, the city was also left to house many of the region's disadvantaged residents. This type of abandonment occurred in many urban places and is certainly not unique to Atlanta.

In the early 1980s, however, soon after the nation's economy moved out of recession, new patterns of settlement began to emerge in Atlanta. A significant level of investment returned to the city in office buildings, retail establishments, hotels, and multi-family housing. By the end of the 1980s, the city's losses in population and private investment had bottomed out. And while most of growth in the region during the 1990s occurred in the suburbs, the demand for new housing, employment, and places of lodging within the city, virtually absent for three decades, has become increasingly strong. Since 1990, a net total of more than 6,000 new units of housing have been added, and the city's population has grown by over 10,000 persons. This resurgence has enabled Atlanta to take greater advantage of the Olympics than would otherwise have been possible.

Two-thirds of the events will be concentrated in Atlanta's downtown, vastly increasing the impact on the central city.

The Olympics As Catalyst

It is difficult to grasp the significance of the Olympics without understanding its scale and character. The Atlanta Olympics, involving 198 countries, will be the largest gathering of nations in history. Between two and three million people will visit the city during the event, and another two to three billion people, over a third of the global population, will watch the competition via television and satellite.

The impact on Atlanta—both city and region—will be especially great. With a population of under three million residents, the urban area is the smallest to host an Olympics since the Helsinki and Melbourne Olympics in the 1950s. New competitions, new nations, and expanded interest through the spread of communication technologies have all added to the size and focus of the event. For example, the 15,000 athletes and coaches registered for the Atlanta Olympics is one and a half times more than the number which arrived only 12 years ago in Los Angeles, a region of 12.5 million people at the time. Furthermore, while Los Angeles spread its competition sites across much of southern California, two-thirds of the Atlanta events will be concentrated in its downtown area, vastly increasing the impact on the central city.

Shaping the Olympic Development Program

The city's Olympic Development Program, prepared by its Department of Planning and Development, grew out of an articulated image of the future city. Three planning questions were raised and debated which helped to define this image: First, what roles does the city expect to play in the next several decades? Second, what kind of city must be developed in order for it to play these roles? And, finally, how can the Olympics be used as a catalyst to achieve such a city?

Future Roles of the City

Two roles were deemed essential for the city to play during the early decades of the next century. One was reestablishing its former position as the central place within what has now become a booming, yet fragmented, region. The second was building a larger capacity which would enable the city to operate more effectively within a network of international cities.

Fundamental changes have occurred to Atlanta, its region, and its people during the decades following World War II. Routine public decisions concerning growth during the early years were largely made by a single government. The delivery of services was directed by the tenured heads of a small number of public agencies with clearly defined missions and authority. Information flowed from a few confined sources. The major decisions, as described by Floyd Hunter in *Community Power Structure*, flowed through a hierarchy dominated by a handful of civic leaders. This way of making decisions has now been drastically altered. Centralized authority and decision-

making, both public and private, has long vanished. The region has exploded, like a local Big Bang, with pieces scattered across 18 counties. The once vibrant center now monopolizes only a few functions, like banking, government, and conventions. The region is now composed of over 60 local governments.

Furthermore, the loss of tight control over development and service delivery has occurred at a time when such control is most required. Of the major problems facing the city, few can be solved by the city alone. Issues concerning transportation, land development, the environment, water supply, economic development, solid waste, and public safety call for a unified and coordinated city and regional approach. Yet there are few mechanisms for addressing these issues across jurisdictional boundaries. If the Atlanta region is to confront its problems related to growth and service delivery, a structure will have to be imposed through which these matters can be addressed. Thus, the first role which the city seeks to play in the next century is that of reestablishing itself as the central place within a fragmented regional settlement.

The second role is played out in an international arena. Over the past decade, Atlanta has built strong linkages to other large urban centers throughout the world. It has done this through the globalization of many Atlanta-based private corporations and public institutions such as Delta Airlines, CNN, Coca Cola, Holiday Inn International, the Carter Center, CARE, United Parcel Service, the Center for Disease Control, and the Georgia Institute of Technology. The city has recognized that its future is tied not only to its ability to unite a fragmented region, but also to an emerging relationship with other urban places across the globe.

Characteristics of the Future City

If the first question is what roles Atlanta will play in the 21st Century, the second is how to design the city to play these roles. Over the past decade, Atlanta has moved to put in place many of the plans, programs and regulations which will shape its next phase of development. These are intended to advance three major characteristics of the future city which have dominatedAtlanta's vision for itself:

1. A high-quality physical environment,

2. Greater reliance on alternative modes of transportation, and

3. An improved quality of life for its citizens.

The city's *Comprehensive Development Plan* describes the first characteristic of the future city as follows:

> Our actions should lead us towards the creation of a more humane, safe and enjoyable place to live, work and raise our children. People have come to Atlanta to be with one another, to share their lives, products and experiences. The future city requires that we promote places for human association and activity, strive for variety and choice in our daily lives, and seek to obtain beauty and humanity.

In order to create a more humane and enjoyable place, Atlanta has now begun to:

- Increase the abundance, quality and accessibility of its parks, plazas and open spaces,
- Provide more opportunities for pedestrian movements,
- Enhance the visual quality and beauty of the city,
- Secure the city's irreplaceable historic heritage and cultural life,
- Protect its natural and man-made environments, and
- Provide for a safer environment.

A few examples of actions already underway by the city and others include the creation of a new citywide Parks, Open Space and Greenway Plan under which new open spaces have been created and older facilities improved. In addition, the city is also adopting a Public Arts Master Plan, strong tree and sign ordinances, an increased number of historic districts, and stream clean-up programs.

The second characteristic of the future city is stated as follows:

> We need to establish integrated, multi-modal transportation systems which would move people and goods in a more efficient and environmentally sensitive manner. Greater balance is required in the development of a variety of transportation modes. We should also seek out increased acces-

> sibility to jobs, services and places of leisure. All systems and all modes need to be built so as to have minimal effect on the quality of residential life and on the natural environment.

In order to produce transportation systems which are more integrated, balanced and sensitive to neighborhoods and environmental concerns, Atlanta is seeking to:

- Increase the efficiency of existing streets and arterials,
- Place greater emphasis on the movement of people by rail and alternative modes of travel,
- Adhere more faithfully to a comprehensive and continuous transportation planning process, and
- Provide for safer and more efficient operations at Hartsfield Atlanta International Airport.

Several examples of efforts in this area include: the design of a new $130 million downtown passenger terminal, construction of a $100 million advanced traffic signalization program, expansion of the rapid rail transit system, design of a 12-corridor commuter rail network, expansion of airport runways and the construction of the world's largest international terminal, completion of a 112-mile Greenway Trail system, and the adoption of a 300 mile on-street commuter bike system.

The third characteristic of the future city is stated as follows:

> There is a need to build a City which would raise the quality and productivity of the lives of all citizens. The City's neighborhoods are among our most valued and essential ingredients to our quality of life. As such, they must be a closely protected asset. At the same time, far too many of Atlanta's residents are poor, live unproductive lives, and are not participating in the recent surge of growth and prosperity.

As such, the city has set its course on assuring that Atlanta is livable for all of its citizens, seeking to:

- Protect, maintain, and enhance the quality of its neighborhoods,
- Support greater neighborhood cohesion and empowerment, and
- Promote greater economic and human development and investment in all sections of the city.

Many actions have been undertaken by the city and others to achieve these objectives, including adopting a new subdivision ordinance, launching the programs under Atlanta's designation as an Empowerment Zone city, administering a program to remove more than 1,000 substandard housing units per year, revitalizing several older neighborhoods commercial districts, and linking unemployed persons in poverty-stricken neighborhoods with new jobs being created.

Role of the Olympics

The third and final question is how can the Olympics be used as a catalyst to create such a city. The answer to this question shaped the city's Olympic Development Program. Mindful of its 21st century vision, the capital investments now under construction and programs underway have focused on those projects which would not only serve the city during the Games, but also move it towards this vision. Activities launched in preparation for the Olympics have fallen into one or more of three groups.

1. Actions taken to accommodate the visitors to the Games. A wide range of activities and improvements will be required to accommodate the millions of people who will visit Atlanta to participate in and enjoy the Summer Games. These projects, which will be permanent additions to the city, are mostly of four types: parks, plazas, and open space; pedestrian systems; traffic management and alternative travel modes; and public safety.

2. Actions undertaken to improve the inner-city neighborhoods affected by the Olympics. The city initially identified nine neighborhoods which will be directly affected by activities associated with the Olympic Games. (The Corporation for Olympic Development in Atlanta has since expanded the list to 15 neighborhoods.) Four of these neighborhoods would be especially impacted and were given the highest priority. The programmed improvements were largely physical, starting with comprehensive neighborhood plans drawn up by residents and planners, then

identifying improvements to parks, lighting, streets and sidewalks, drainage, and so on. In some cases social programs were contemplated, such as an after school program, employment and training for work on Olympic construction projects, as well as public safety initiatives.

3. Actions which will create a lasting legacy for the city. Finally, the Olympic event will leave a number of long-needed improvements to serve as a memory of the event. Some of the projects are physical landmarks, such as the parks and sports complexes, while others, such as the anti-poverty programs and public art, are less corporeal. In total, they are intended to leave a lasting imprint from the Olympics on the future city.

Implementing the Program

The Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games (ACOG), a public-private corporation, is in charge of providing for the competition itself, together with the programs and activities required to arrange for the events and to handle the logistics. This involves the housing, transportation, feeding, entertainment, security, ticketing, communication, signage, and marketing for athletes and their families, members of each national and international sports federation, fifteen thousand members of the media, plus thousands of dignitaries, employees and support personnel. For the most part, they will be utilizing existing facilities. Nevertheless, a number of new facilities have had to be constructed, including an 85,000-seat stadium, aquatics center, tennis facility, basketball arena, velodrome, equestrian facilities, and venues for shooting, archery, and rowing, as well as housing for 10,000 athletes. Since automobiles will largely be banned from the downtown area, ACOG has had to borrow 1,400 buses, assemble remote parking spaces for 125,000 vehicles, and arrange for bus transfer to the rail system.

A second set of preparations has gone on to ready the city itself to welcome its visitors. This has principally been in the hands of the city agencies and another organization, the Corporation for Olympic Development in Atlanta (CODA), a public entity specially created by the city to lead the activities related to non-competition infrastructure construction, neighborhood revitalization efforts, and public art initiatives. The City of Atlanta established CODA in January of 1993. Functioning as an independent public/private arm of the city with a public mandate, its mission is to implement the Olympic Development Program. The Mayor shares the chair of the 24-member Board with a prominent business leader, and the members represent a broad range of business, civic, and non-profit groups. CODA's 29-person staff is led by four senior personnel with considerable public and private planning, administrative, design, engineering, and redevelopment experience.

As stated in its originating documents, the primary mission of CODA is to prepare the city for the 1996 Summer Olympic Games, to use this unique opportunity to enhance the quality of life for Atlanta's citizens, and to leave a legacy for future generations. Its tasks are to assist the city's Department of Planning and Development to finalize a master development program and then to undertake plans, set priorities and schedules, and secure financing for implementing the program. While the availability of funds, feasibility of the projects, and political demands have been constantly changing, the basic elements of the plan are now under construction.

CODA's record of success in meeting its mission is impressive. As it enters the final stages of the implementation of its efforts, CODA is completing virtually all of the initial Olympic Development Program projects. Over the past two years, a few of the original projects have been dropped or postponed, but CODA has also expanded the original scope of the program. Additionally, it has coordinated a large number of Olympic-related projects which are being undertaken by others.

In its efforts to accommodate the visitors, for example, CODA has embarked on an ambitious Public Spaces Program for parks, corridors and public enhancements. The purpose of this effort is to:

> create and enhance quality permanent public spaces within the 2.5 kilometer Olympic Ring, the downtown and adjacent areas in which most of the competition will be held. Intended to leave a legacy which is civic in nature, the Public Space Program seeks to create spaces to enjoy, to commemorate the city's unique heritage, and to bind together the citizens of a city which values its public environment, in spaces which are usable, safe, maintainable and memorable.

The public space initiatives have been adopted to:

- increase the capacity, security and quality of the pedestrian environment in the center city,

- engage a wider discourse on the public realm through the creation of new public space types and uses,
- leverage investment in the public infrastructure so as to encourage economic redevelopment in adjacent private areas, and
- serve as symbols of the city's collective identity, both past and present, making its heroes and stories visible.

The content of the public space program consists of:

- enhancing 11 pedestrian corridors,
- creating and improving nine parks, plazas and civic spaces, including four art parks and a bike path,
- installing 22 public art, historic monuments and project enhancements;
- undertaking 14 inner-city neighborhood street improvements, and
- constructing several special projects, including a signage system, street furniture, and an electric bus shuttle system to link cultural sites.

CODA's other major initiative, designed to improve the Olympic neighborhoods, expanded the list of inner-city neighborhoods affected by the Olympics to 15 such communities. It was clear from the outset that rebuilding the inner-city neighborhoods was to be a long-term, almost permanent, undertaking. Furthermore, the efforts of CODA were largely confined to physical improvements, which are only one piece of the effort to rebuild the distressed communities. In fact, most of the social services needed in these places are not under the authority of the city at all, but rather are the mission of County, State or non-profit organizations.

CODA, therefore, has taken two approaches. It has launched a redevelopment process in the 15 neighborhoods, using the powers and procedures remaining from the days of urban renewal. Second, it undertook to make physical improvements in most of the 15 neighborhoods, with high-priority given to communities especially affected by activities associated with the Olympics. The city's planning staff drafted master plans for the communities with citizen participation. CODA then produced the required redevelopment plans and coordinated infrastructure projects being carried out by others to make the physical improvements.

Funding for CODA's efforts has been a major struggle throughout its life. Only limited amounts of money was committed from public sources at any one level. In time, funds emerged from a variety of sources.

The City of Atlanta passed a $149 million bond referendum in June of 1994. Primarily aimed at the replacement and restoration of storm utility lines in streets and parks, major portions of the improvements have been Olympic-related. The city has also used monies from its General Fund, previous bond lettings, and its impact fee program to resurface neighborhood streets and improve its parks.

Federal funds have helped to underwrite major Olympic projects, including grants from the Department of Transportation's enhancements and congestion mitigation and other Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) funds, the National Park Service to expand and improve the Martin Luther King, Jr. Historic Site, and the Environmental Protection Agency, which underwrote the construction of an important Greenway Trail. In addition, the State of Georgia has upgraded the traffic signals, rebuilt two downtown bridges and landscaped the expressways primarily using Federal transportation dollars.

> Large local corporations have made important contributions, especially in rehabilitating and constructing housing in downtown Atlanta.

Non-profit organizations have made sizable financial contributions. The Woodruff Foundation has provided major funding for the new Centennial Olympic Park, Piedmont Park and the Greenway Trails. They have also underwritten numerous planning and construction projects of the city and CODA. The PATH Foundation has led the efforts to fund and construct major portions of the Greenway Trails. Trees Atlanta, with major financial assistance from Woodruff and other foundations and corporations, has planted more than 10,000 trees.

Finally, important contributions have been made by large local corporations, especially in rehabilitating and constructing housing in downtown Atlanta and in a number of low-income neighborhoods. More than 1,000 housing units, for example, are being placed in the downtown, an area which has attracted few new residential units over the past several decades.

Conditions Underpinning Atlanta's Successful Efforts

Atlanta is following the course set by the City of Chicago a century ago when it recovered from the destruction of the 1871 fire to become the international city it is today. During the final decades of the 19th century, Chicago put essential infrastructure in place. Public and private investments tied the city to the national rail system. The city constructed an inner-city rail network, making adjacent farmlands available to absorb new growth. Chicago also cleared out its waterfront, constructed boulevards and produced great parks. All of this was crowned by the Columbian Exposition of 1893, which exposed Chicago to world scrutiny and admiration.

The City of Atlanta, together with other public agencies, has improved and expanded the park system, rebuilt several downtown bridges, replaced major portions of the aging infrastructure, extended the rapid transit system, and enhanced the quality of streets, sidewalks, and public plazas. The state and city have designed a new $130 million downtown passenger terminal for interstate and commuting trains and buses. Most importantly, the city has begun to seriously address the declined state of several inner-city neighborhoods. Now, with its recent Empowerment Zone designation, the city will be able to better attend to the social and employment needs of its residents.

Reviewing the past five years, four major conditions appear to have contributed significantly to Atlanta's ability to use the Olympics to shape its future.

Reversal of Development Trends

The timing was fortunate. Shifting regional development patterns has brought additional population and substantial investments to a city experiencing withdrawal and abandonment. This reversal of trends has played a major role in the city's ability to orchestrate the changes sought. To the business community, such changes produced the first evidence in many years of a strengthening marketplace. This raised the confidence of the lending and bond-rating communities and encouraged them to provide financial support for public and private projects which suddenly seemed far less risky.

Presence of Strong Political, Business and Managerial Leadership

Atlanta has a history of exceptionally enlightened community leadership. A succession of strong mayors—Hartsfield, Allen, Massell, and Jackson—together with a impressive group of civic and corporate leaders led Atlanta through a wartime and postwar era characterized by both rapid growth and stagnation. When the Olympics period arrived, both Mayor Maynard Jackson and Mayor Bill Campbell grasped the opportunities which accompany such an occasion and used the attendant energies and resources to raise the quality of the lives of the citizens. They and other leaders were able to articulate the meaning of the moment and bind the community to their vision, turning the opportunity of sponsoring a 19-day festival into a catalyst for building a future city.

Finally, the city was able to assemble a small cadre of talented and experienced planners, designers, administrators, and managers, who possessed good political and public decision skills and were willing to devote years of their lives and energies to this event and to the city. This nucleus of able public officials became the critical team which has pushed the program to its successful conclusion.

Early Agreement on the Olympic Development Program

It is problematic enough to launch a program designed to rebuild and redirect the development of a large American city towards a defined future. The challenge is enhanced given the scale of the project and the limited resources and time. The essential objective was to build a common agenda in a diverse and shifting environment. The announcement that Atlanta was to host the 1996 Summer Olympics Games was made in September of 1990. By July, 1992, Mayor Jackson presented the Olympic Development Program to the International Olympic Committee. Five months after this presentation, CODA, the implementing agency, was created. And now, three years later, almost a hundred projects are nearing completion, not including a similar number of other govern-

mental, non-profit and private projects. Buying into and staying attached to a quickly articulated vision has been central to the success of this effort.

The city was quickly able to find agreement on its vision of the future in part because of its well-established on-going planning process. Each year, the city produces a new Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP) for one-, five- and fifteen-year periods. The plan receives significant input from the public through hearings, television programs, and review by the 24 neighborhood planning units. It is then formally adopted by ordinance of the City Council. Thereafter, no rezoning can be approved which is inconsistent with the CDP, and no capital improvements can be undertaken which are not contained in the CDP. Once the Olympic vision was produced and the Olympic Development Program completed, they too became part of the CDP and were adopted by the governing bodies of the city.

The Character of Atlanta

Although cities in general have much in common and each may resemble others in one respect or another, the character of each city is unique. Atlanta's uniqueness has contributed fundamentally to what was sought and what will now be achieved. Like many places, Atlanta has a great sense of pride in itself. It is brash, if not boastful. It relishes hyperbole. It wants to be noticed and recognized. As such, it has always reached out to a larger dream, and because it deeply believes in its own self-worth, it has been willing to take chances and build for the future. Why else would such a small place proceed to build the world's second largest airport, a modern rail transit system of enormous capacity, and one of the country's largest convention centers? Looking to the future, the city created a water supply during the 1950s which would service its growth well into the 21st Century. This same determination to become, in the words of Henry Grady, the leading newspaper editor in the 1880s, "a great and beautiful city" also fueled the city's readiness to recognize and accommodate the region's and nation's social and racial changes during the 1960's, changes for which Atlanta provided much of the leadership.

The Olympics effort, therefore, is consistent with Atlanta's character. Atlanta has chosen to take on an event of global dimensions not simply to celebrate a brief moment, but to use the moment as a step to what it seeks to become: a place of importance among the great cities of the world in the 21st Century.

Conclusion

Comprehensive planning for mature cities remains a valid and valuable option for urban planners advising on ways to obtain a defined future. For such planning to work, however, at least three conditions must be present. First, for large-scale efforts like Atlanta's, such planning requires an early agreement on the goals and the embracing of a common agenda of what will be required to reach these goals. Second, the process must express a broad vision at one level and detailed implementation strategies and sources of funding at another. And third, affected citizens must buy into the process at the outset, and the political leadership must provide strong enduring commitments. The presence of these conditions in Atlanta has given the city the opportunity to prepare itself for its future and to use the Olympics to move the city towards that future. CP

References

Atlanta Department of Planning and Development. 1992. *Olympic Development Program*, Atlanta.

Corporation for Olympic Development in Atlanta. 1996. *The Civic Trust: Parks, Corridors and Public Enhancements*, (unpublished).

Hunter, Floyd. 1953. *Community Power Structure*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press).

North Carolina Main Street Program at 15 Years: Giving Communities Hope for Their Downtowns

Rodney L. Swink

In *Main Street: Open For Business*, the 1984 report on the initial three-year demonstration effort of the National Main Street Center, North Carolina Governor James B. Hunt, Jr., was quoted as saying "The North Carolina Main Street Program has been an unqualified success. The activities of the first five Main Street communities have clearly shown that no city or town needs to give up on its downtown business district" (Glisson 1984). In October of 1995, as he announced yet another round of new Main Street communities, Governor Hunt once again said, "the North Carolina Main Street Program is truly one of this state's greatest success stories. Communities are rallying around their downtown areas, creating jobs and preserving their community's heritage through this effort" (Press Release 1995). In an era when government-run programs are frequently under fire or in question, the Main Street program is one effort that continues to enjoy positive results and support and to give communities hope for their downtowns.

The Early Program

The Main Street Program was created by the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) in 1977 through a three-year demonstration effort in three mid-western towns. Based on the lessons learned and the overwhelming interest generatedby the pilot program, the Trust decided to create the National Main Street Center® (NMSC) to expand their work to communities nationwide. From 38 applicants, six states (Colorado, Georgia, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Pennsylvania and Texas) were chosen to participate in yet another three-year demonstration. Each state selected five communities to be the first national Main Street cities. From the enthusiasm and success of these first towns the number of Main Street programs nationally has grown to over 1100 communities in 39 states. While each program may vary in some aspect of funding, organization, or focus, they all share the Main Street philosophy and its unique Four Point Approach™.

Rodney L. Swink, FASLA, has been the director of the North Carolina Main Street Program since 1984. He is a graduate of North Carolina StateUniversity with a bachelor's degree in economics and a master's degree in landscape architecture. He is a Fellow in the American Society of Landscape Architects.

The Main Street Approach

While many other downtown revitalization efforts have failed, Main Street has distinguished itself with its thorough and comprehensive approach to the process of revitalization. At its simplest, Main Street is about understanding and managing change, but in reality the program goes much deeper. The Main Street approach features four points:

1. *Organization*—Building partnerships to create a consistent revitalization program and develop effective management and leadership downtown. Diverse groups—merchants, bankers, public officials, chambers of commerce and civic groups—must work together to improve downtown. Inherent within this point is the necessity for professional downtown management.

2. *Promotion*—Reestablishing downtown as a compelling place for shoppers, investors, and visitors. This means not only improving sales but also rekindling community excitement and involvement. Promotion ranges from street festi-

vals to retail merchandising, from community education to aggressive public relations.

3. *Design*—Enhancing the visual quality of the downtown. Attention must be given to all elements of the downtown environment, not just buildings and storefronts but also public improvements, rear entries, signs, landscaping, window displays, and graphic materials.

4. *Economic Restructuring*—Strengthening the existing economic assets of the business district while diversifying its economic base. Activities include recruiting new stores to provide a balanced retail mix; converting unused space into housing, entertainment, or cultural facilities; and sharpening the competitiveness of Main Street's traditional merchants.

Practically any downtown issue can fit under this four point umbrella, and blending these elements assures that no one issue dominates. Downtown decline rarely can be traced to one event or deficiency. Therefore, revitalization requires a comprehensive review of all of the issues affecting the downtown without undue emphasis on any one area. Comprehensiveness is but one of the elements of the Main Street philosophy.

The Main Street Philosophy

Communities are most successful when they combine the four point approach with Main Street's eight key principles. It is this combination of philosophy and strategy that has proven to be most valuable. The principles are:

1. *Comprehensiveness*—A single project cannot revitalize a downtown or commercial district. An ongoing series of initiatives is vital to build community support and create lasting progress.

2. *Incrementalism*—Small projects make a big difference. They demonstrate that "things are happening" on Main Street and hone the skills and confidence the program will need to tackle more complex problems.

3. *Self-help*—While the National Main Street Center and other state programs, such as our North Carolina Main Street program, can provide valuable direction and hands-on technical assistance, only local leadership can breed long-term success by fostering and demonstrating community involvement and commitment to the revitalization effort.

4. *Public-private partnership*—Every local Main Street program needs the support and expertise of both the public and private sectors and increasingly, the non-profit sector as well. For an effective partnership, each must recognize the strengths and weaknesses of the other.

5. *Identifying and capitalizing on existing assets*—One of the key goals is to help communities recognize and make the best use of their unique offerings. Local assets provide the solid foundation for a successful Main Street initiative.

6. *Quality*—From storefront design to promotional campaigns and special events, quality must be the main goal.

7. *Change*—Changing community attitudes and habits is essential to bring about a commercial district renaissance. A carefully planned Main Street program will help shift public perceptions and practices to support and sustain the revitalization process.

8. *Action-oriented*—Frequent, visible changes in the look and activities of the commercial district will reinforce the perception of positive change. Small but dramatic improvements early in the process will remind the community that the revitalization effort is under way.

Early Revitalization Efforts

Downtown revitalization is not a recent phenomenon. People have been talking about and attempting downtown revitalization since the first by-pass was built and the first store moved out to the strip. Previous revitalization programs came in many forms and from many sources, both public—federal, state and local—and private. The federal government, for example, gave us urban renewal, a program embraced by cities who hoped that by tearing down large blocks of buildings, land could be assembled to entice developers to create malls or similar new developments. Rarely did this happen. More often, the land remained vacant, only contributing to the image that downtown was dying. While it is true that some of this land has

since been used for public purposes, more often than not the land remains unused or underutilized, a sad reminder of lost architecture and misdirected strategy.

But the federal government was not alone in seeking solutions. Closer to home, merchants, property owners, and local officials—often encouraged by planners—were trying all manner of strategies including modernization, parking development, pedestrian malls, and streetscape improvements, among others. Under the banner of modernization, property owners were encouraged to cover their "old-fashioned" buildings with aluminum and other metals. This would add an updated look and signal customers that downtown was "just like the new mall." In another application of lessons from the mall, merchants became obsessed with the need for more parking, even if it meant tearing down whole blocks of buildings. Many believed that the real message had to do with appearance and comfort and that if downtowns were pedestrian-friendly, all would be well. Hence the rise of pedestrian malls across the country. In communities lacking sufficient resources or courage to undertake wholesale street closing for pedestrian mall development, there was still the chance to do streetscape improvements. New lights, a few trees, benches, and coordinated trash receptacles would surely make a difference, or so many thought.

All of these efforts were well-intended and at the time of their application, the best approaches available. What history has shown though is that successful revitalization depends on more than a single-issue strategy. Downtowns cannot address just parking, design, or business development. Successful revitalization requires the blending of strategies in a comprehensive manner, weaving many elements together to create a strong, revitalized fabric. It all begins with understanding the forces of change that have lead to downtown's decline, and then learning how to apply those forces to generate positive results.

Downtown decline cannot be traced to a single cause, except in the rare case



Property owners were encouraged to cover their "old-fashioned" buildings with aluminum and other metals. This would add an updated look and signal customers that downtown was "just like the new mall."



of the company town that loses its main employer. More often, downtown decline is the result of numerous smaller (and sometimes larger) decisions made over time, rarely with the intent to harm downtown or its businesses. For example, when federal government officials decided to create the Eisenhower Intestate Highway System, they did so with national defense in mind. It was not their intent, at least initially, to open up the largely undeveloped countryside to development. Likewise, home mortgage subsidies were designed to encourage and facilitate home ownership. No one considered the possibility that the combination of newly accessible land and subsidized home development would change not only how people lived but also how they would work and shop. In hindsight it seems obvious that if people relocate, the stores will follow. And that is just what happened, in increasing numbers, from the late 1950s on. But again, downtown decline cannot be blamed on or traced solely to a few external policy decisions.

Locally, governments made decisions that contributed to the very decline they seek to avoid. Supporting road extensions, expanding water and sewer into previously unserved areas, rezoning rural land for commercial use, or failing to zone are all actions, however well-intended, that contribute to downtown decline. It must be again stated that few if any of these decisions were made with a conscious intent to harm downtown. But the results are undeniable.

Private individuals are not without blame. While business and property owners will understandibly direct their investments according to market changes, the first few to leave downtown erode the confidence of those who remain, lessening the likelihood of their reinvesting in their current property. Each business closing further dampens the investment climate. Property owners are less likely to repair and maintain their buildings if they believe that the market is leaving and such expenditures will not be recouped. This reinforces the spiral of disinvestment and decline. If the local government does not enforce minimum maintenance or building code standards, buildings and the tax base will continue to decay.

The forces of change are many; numerous individuals and groups have had a hand in contributing to the decline of our downtowns. No one alone can be singled out for blame. It will therefore take the collective impact of numerous new decisions to reinvigorate our city centers, from all of the players mentioned, and others as well. Understanding these many forces of change, we must now learn how to apply these forces to create a better end. This multi-issue philosphy is the reason for Main Street's success over single-issue approaches.

The Main Street Program in North Carolina

As previously mentioned, North Carolina was one of the original states to participate in Main Street. Being in on the ground floor as the program was still taking shape allowed the earliest participants—the communities, their managers, and boards—to test the theories and polish the strategies. Without the hard work, imagination, dedication, and enthusiasm of these first participants, there might not be a Main Street program today. Even though people had been trying to address downtown decline for years, the lack of successes had lead to a certain skepticism about the potential of any program.

Nevertheless, when the National Trust for Historic Preservation invited states to apply for participation, North Carolina was ready. With support from the Division of Archives and History, the Division of Community Assistance submitted an application. The cities proposed for the program were New Bern, Salisbury, Shelby, Tarboro, and Washington. With their strong preservation interests and community, and the support of local planning staffs, the first public-private partnerships were enacted. Although the sailing was not always smooth, the lessons learned from those tentative relationships became the program's foundation.

Among the first critical observations was that "success" would require partnerships. Even in the early 1980s, resources were insufficient for any one group to tackle something as complex as downtown development alone. While it was not unusual to try to get someone else to shoulder the burden, that approach rarely worked. Success came when the public and private sectors learned to share not only resources but also responsibility for outcomes. In Shelby, for instance, the city provided initial funding and management direction. After their Main Street resource team assessment, they began an aggressive effort to pull private dollars and private leaders into their program. This led to the creation of the Uptown Shelby Association, Inc., a public-private vehicle. In New Bern, Swiss Bear, Inc. was similarly created to be the means for public and private cooperation, both financial and political. These groups continue to guide the revitalization efforts in their respective cities by serving as the conduit for ideas and the focal point for development initiatives.

Forming a partnership initially serves as a means to generate financial support, a pooling of dollars. Very quickly, though, it becomes a means for sharing visions of the future downtown. Everyone involved with downtown has a vision of what revitalization might mean. It is essential to gather those ideas and shape them into a shared, collective vision. Otherwise people may find themselves working at cross purposes, in effect canceling out their individual efforts by pursuing different views of the future. Partnership allows and demands shared responsibility, resources, and vision. If any one lesson stands out from 15 years of Main Street assistance, it is the importance of shared vision.

Another early lesson from Main Street involved the merging of economic development and historic preservation philosophies. The economic developmnent aspect gave the program credibility in the eyes of local and state officials. It is distinguished from other economic development efforts by its emphasis on building on local assets, with a primary focus on historic resources. Mary Means (who conceived the Main Street program as director of the National Trust's Midwest Regional Office) noted in her Afterword to the three-year report on Main Street, "When preservation is viewed not as an *activity* but as an *attitude*—an outlook toward managing change in our towns and cities—the historic buildings that shape each community's unique character can be seen as assets to a revitalization program."

The belief, borne out by 15 years of program development and success, is that small communities can spur economic development by utilizing existing resources, which in the case of downtown includes architectural and cultural resources. Donovan Rypkema, author of *The Economics of Historic Preservation*, notes that "in economics it is the differentiated product that commands a monetary premium. If in the long run we want to attract capital, to attract investment to our communities, we must differentiate them from anywhere else. It is our built environment in general and our historic buildings in particular that express, perhaps better than anything else, our diversity, our identity, our individuality, our differentiation" (Rypkema, 1994). Communities like Salisbury, Tarboro, and Washington capitalized on their unique architectural and historical heritage to build a renewed economic base in the downtown area by utilizing their existing building stock and marketing their identity.

There are direct economic benefits of historic preservation. The federal tax code provides a 20 percent investment tax credit for the rehabilitation of privately-owned, income-producing historic buildings that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places or that are contributing historic buildings within National Register Historic Districts. There is an additional five percent state investment tax credit in North Carolina for projects certified under the federal program. Such incentives are frequently packaged with others like facade grants and loan pools to create an inviting investment climate downtown.

> Since 1980, downtown investment in Main Street communities has surpassed $5.02 billion.

The results are noteworthy. The National Main Street Center reports that since 1980 downtown investment in the over 1,100 Main Street communities has surpassed $5.02 billion. This reflects 26,734 net new businesses, 101,505 net new jobs, and over 38,000 rehabilitated buildings. The reinvestment ratio, the average number of dollars generated in communities for every dollar used to operate the local program, is $27.88 to $1.00.

North Carolina has contributed its fair share to these statistics. We have seen over $350 million of new investment, 1,663 net new businesses, 6,769 net new jobs and over 1,388 rehabilitated buildings. These numbers reflect the record (as reported) of 36 communities through July 1995. While numbers help to describe the economic impact of Main Street, they only tell part of the story of the program's value. Of equal or greater importance is the change in attitude that accompanies Main Street revitalization. People who have seen previous efforts fail, people who have led earlier efforts, people who, for what ever reason, think that downtown has seen its best days, are among those now becoming the champions of downtown revitalization, and they are doing so because they see results. While the Main Street approach involves planning, it stresses action. Action in the absence of planning is at best inefficient and at worst destructive. But planning without action is often time wasted, and no one is willing to do that today. So the Main Street approach emphasizes the need to plan, but of equal importance, it emphasizes the need to make things happen, build momentum, and show results. As each

success is celebrated, the doubters become less doubtful and belief in the possiblities grows. Without a change in attitude, nothing positive will occur. But once the attitude shifts, then the real impacts begin. With a change in attitude comes something even more important—a change in action, and that is the true desired result.

While Main Street has experienced significant success, it is still a fragile initiative in many communities. People are impatient with an incremental program and there is often much pressure to produce immediate results. The resources necessary to support such a program are always available but may require a shifting of funds from one area to another, and in a time of limited resources, competition can be fierce. Every downtown organization must be able to demonstrate, justify, and explain its need annually and only those who continue to build shared vision, genuine partnerships, and community support can withstand the tough scrutiny that is typical of today's political and financial arenas. Not every community selected to Main Street has stayed in the program. Reasons vary but most stem from a change in local priorities. However, some of the communities who dropped the program are now renewing their interest. Ultimately, the North Carolina program emphasizes the self-help nature of Main Street, and when a community accepts its partnership role with the state program, positive results occur.

Summary

The Main Street program has become one of the most successful community-based economic development programs ever. It has proven to be more than a downtown revitalization initiative; it is really a community revitalization initiative. The program has demonstrated the keys to successful community development by bringing people together to focus on their future, share their dreams, visions, and the commitment to and ownership of those results. The job is not finished—it has only begun. But the lessons learned and the continuing growth of the network from which new lessons can be learned gives hope that our downtowns can still be places of commerce, culture, heritage, and in the best sense, places of community spirit. CP

References

Glisson, Linda S. 1984. *Main Street: Open for Business,* A Three-Year Special Report (Washington, D.C.: National Trust for Historic Preservation).

National Main Street Center. 1995. World Wide Web Home Page. Available online (http://www2.nthp.org/trust).

North Carolina Main Street Center. 1995. Press Release, October 27.

Rypkema, Donovan D. 1994. *The Economics of Historic Preservation, A Community Leader's Guide.* (Washington, D.C.: National Trust for Historic Preservation).

Greensboro's Enterprise Community Strategic Plan

Mike Cowhig

In the summer of 1994, Greensboro was one of eight North Carolina cities that applied for the federal Enterprise Community (EC) grant program, a major economic and community development initiative of the Clinton Administration. The EC program offered cities nearly $3 million in Social Service Block Grant funds. These funds, unlike entitlement programs, applied to a broad range of activities and came with few strings attached. The only stipulation was that the funds be used to help reduce poverty in "distressed" neighborhoods.

Charlotte was the only North Carolina city that was awarded an Enterprise Community grant among the approximately 100 recipient cities nationwide. Although Greensboro did not win a grant, it found the application process to be a rewarding experience in a number of ways.

Enterprise Community Program is Atypical

According to the EC application guidebook, "This program is the first step in rebuilding communities in America's poverty-stricken inner cities and rural heartlands. It is designed to empower people and communities all across this nation by inspiring Americans to work together to create jobs and opportunity."

The application was unlike typical government applications in that it contained only a few pages of forms to fill out. However, it required a strategic plan describing in detail the measures the community would take to reduce poverty and the benchmarks it would use to measure progress. The strategic plan had to include measures of progress like realistic estimates of the number of jobs that would be created. The application required that residents of "distressed" neighborhoods participate in developing the strategic plan, and that the plan include a mechanism for continuous neighborhood-based planning. Clearly, more than a perfunctory citizen participation exercise was expected of Enterprise applicants.

Four key principles underlie the Enterprise philosophy:

1. Economic Opportunity

Economic opportunity means jobs and work, with emphasis on programs that create new jobs, provide training for upwardly mobile jobs, or help people to start businesses. The kinds of jobs and businesses created are important. Ideally, the jobs should offer opportunity for advancement, and the businesses should be located in underserved neighborhoods. In the Enterprise model, neighborhood revitalization starts with the economic independence and self-sufficiency of residents.

2. Sustainable Community Development

Sustainable community development refers to the physical environment of neighborhoods. Are they safe? Is housing in good condition and suitable for families? Is transportation available to residents? Are health care and other human services accessible? Are learning resources and employment opportunities available in the community? These are basic needs that most people take for granted, but for most residents of EC neighborhoods they represent barriers to economic well-being. The strategic plan should dem-

***Mike Cowhig**, AICP, is a Community Planner with the City of Greensboro Department of Housing and Community Development. Cowhig was Team Leader for Greensboro's Enterprise Community Strategic Planning Process.*

onstrate that the community is willing to bring the necessary resources to bear to meet these needs.

3. Community-Based Partnership

Broad participation from across the community is fundamental to the Enterprise approach to neighborhood revitalization. The Enterprise partnership starts with those who will be directly affected—neighborhood residents. They are the ones with the best perspective on what will work for their neighborhood, and therefore they must be involved in the planning process. Next, the partnership should include stakeholders in the neighborhood such as community-based organizations, housing and community development nonprofits, and city and county departments and agencies. Finally, the partnership must include those who can channel resources to the neighborhood—political leaders, employers, churches, philanthropies, and educational institutions.

4. Strategic Vision For Change

The strategic plan must set realistic and measurable goals along with performance standards that reflect a shared vision of how the community intends to respond to the needs of EC residents. For example, a commitment on the part of the local job training program to prepare 25 EC residents to take skilled manufacturing jobs should be coupled with a commitment by a local manufacturer to hire those residents once they have successfully completed training. EC funds might be used to expand the program so that an additional 25 residents could receive training and be placed in jobs.

Removing Barriers to Change

To assist communities in implementing their strategic plans, the Clinton Administration promised to remove burdensome programmatic regulations whenever possible, saying, "To accomplish this goal we will work with all communities that have submitted a strategic plan for change, even if they do not receive Empowerment Zone or Enterprise Community designation. We will strive to overcome programmatic, regulatory, and statutory impediments to encourage more effective economic, human, physical, environmental, and community development activities." It is left to the local community to identify those rules and regulations that create roadblocks to economic success. The example most often cited is public housing requirements that discourage residents from taking better paying jobs for fear of losing their eligibility. Grassroots participation in the planning process is essential in order to learn how these rules affect people's lives.

The Crew of the Enterprise

The project team recognized the importance of engaging the community in the strategic planning process and worked hard to ensure that they provided for meaningful public participation.

In Greensboro, the Department of Housing and Community Development was assigned the task of preparing the Enterprise Community grant application. A late decision to apply meant that the department was faced with completing a full blown strategic plan in a little over three months. The project team, nicknamed the "crew of the Enterprise," recognized the importance of engaging the community in the strategic planning process and worked hard to ensure that they provided for meaningful public participation.

In one respect the timing could not have been better for the department since the application project followed on the heels of a management study that included training in team building techniques. The EC project gave department staff an opportunity to put the teamwork skills they had learned into practice. For a few months at least, the entire department functioned as a single team, with planners, administrative staff, and managers all working together to meet the project deadline. Enterprise was also an opportunity to cultivate interdepartmental and interagency team building since help was needed from other city departments, county government, and social service agencies.

Another benefit reported by Greensboro planners was partnership building that bridged social, politi-

cal, and professional boundaries. Housing and Community Development staff have always worked closely with certain agencies and organizations in the community in carrying out the department's mission. During Enterprise, existing working relationships were strengthened and new relationships were created. Moreover, the project brought together for the first time all of those organizations that have a common mission to help the poor—social service agencies, nonprofit organizations, community development corporations, the public housing authority, city departments, colleges, churches, and charitable organizations. Enterprise opened people's eyes to the potential for collaboration and information sharing among these groups.

The Application Process

The first step in the application process was to determine if Greensboro met eligibility requirements. This was done by comparing census data with poverty thresholds. While the phrase "poverty-stricken" seemed too strong to describe any of Greensboro's neighborhoods, census figures showed that there was an area near the downtown with a significant concentration of low-income households. Five contiguous census tracts were found to have poverty rates roughly three times as high as the city as a whole—36% versus 12%. These areas contain most of the larger public housing communities and are the target of most of the city's neighborhood revitalization and affordable housing efforts.

Once the eligibility question was answered and the decision to apply was made, planners began to devise a strategy for recruiting broad participation from a cross section of the community. The first step was to invite staff from city and county departments, nonprofit organizations, human service agencies, and community leaders to a series of briefings about the Enterprise Community initiative. From these briefings a consensus emerged about what shape the planning process would take. Emphatically, it would be a process that effectively reached the grassroots level.

A task force was formed to oversee the project. It included individuals who control vital community resources such as politicians, employers, and colleges and universities, as well as representatives from community-based organizations. The task force was subdivided into four working committees focusing on economic development, community development, education, and human services. In addition to weekly meetings, the task force hosted three public workshops in the EC area. The public workshops were advertised in the community with the help of the police department's Neighborhood Resource Centers and the Greensboro Housing Authority's resident councils who distributed leaflets to more than 7,000 households. Transportation and child care were provided to anyone who needed it, and the workshops were well attended.

Despite this effort to involve residents, there was still dissatisfaction among some task force members. They pointed out that neighborhood residents were not well represented on the working committees. And indeed, while open to the public and held in a convenient location, these weekly meetings were dominated by staff from city and county departments, nonprofit organizations, and human service agencies. There was persistent grumbling that this was "business as usual" with the bureaucrats controlling the process. The community development committee in particular spent the majority of its time trying to resolve the issue of participation. In the end, this committee convinced the rest of the task force that a large portion of the budget should be reserved for programs designed by residents through a neighborhood-based planning process.

In response to the concern that certain segments of the community were not well represented, a series of workshops were scheduled in the neighborhoods at times more convenient to residents. The "mini-workshops" as they were called, were held at homeless shelters, branch libraries, public housing communities, and community centers. The meetings were facilitated by an employee of one of the community-based nonprofits who is well respected in the neighborhoods. The mini-workshops targeted youth, homeless people, young mothers with children, and others who would not likely have participated otherwise. They gave planners an opportunity to hear firsthand about the problems of crime, drugs, homelessness, and joblessness. They heard young mothers complain that they could not take their children to a nearby park for fear of gangs, and elderly residents told of being afraid to leave their homes because of drug activity on the sidewalks. They listened to a young homeless man argue that the hours for admittance to the homeless shelter should be more flexible to accommodate his work schedule.

The task force meetings were not always pleasant and occasionally harsh words were exchanged. Local planners and social workers were confronted by longtime residents with deep resentment about past programs like Urban Renewal, which they argued had

been imposed on their neighborhoods without their consent. There were turf issues among agencies and organizations, and some fledgling organizations clearly felt threatened by the process. Others objected to the City's role as facilitator, and the complaint "this is more of the same" was heard often. Nevertheless, after twelve weeks of meetings, a plan emerged. While far from perfect, the plan was unanimously endorsed by the participants.

Strategic Plan Highlights

"The Enterprise Community strategic planning process has revealed Greensboro as a community on the threshold of reinventing itself as a 21st century city." The summary report for Greensboro's strategic plan begins with this bit of hyperbole which reflects the overarching theme that people should be empowered to help themselves. "Reinventing" within this context refers to the evolution of the relationship between helpers and helped: "To achieve their vision, the residents of Greensboro's Enterprise Community would place a high priority on getting good jobs that pay a living wage for meaningful work, and on starting their own businesses. They also place a high priority on empowering people to help themselves, on educational and other programs to help children and youth to grow up as productive citizens, on partnerships of local organizations, and on public safety, good housing, and accessible child care."

The goals of Greensboro's strategic plan were developed in four areas: community development, education, human services, and economic development. Community development goals included improving housing and public safety and fostering neighborhood self-help. Education goals included provisions for more accessible learning, mentoring, and other efforts to keep teenagers in school. Human services goals included increased self-sufficiency, better access to services, improved health programs, and care for children and the elderly. Economic development goals included job training and employment networking, efforts to assist small and neighborhood businesses, and improved child care and transportation.

Neighborhood empowerment was the cornerstone of Greensboro's strategic plan and reflected the debate over who makes decisions for neighborhoods: "A gradual understanding emerged that a neighborhood empowerment process must come from the Enterprise Community initiative, and it must be strongly grassroots driven. Consensus emerged that neighborhood empowerment is a mega-goal that underlies all other goals. Other priorities included "real" jobs that are meaningful, with decent pay, since this is a key to self-esteem and solving problems such as crime; financing for new businesses because they will create jobs; ensuring that neighborhood residents are actively involved in planning and staffing programs; programs to involve youth in solving community problems; and the creation of partnerships of local organizations that can make a difference."

The following is a breakdown of how funds would have been allocated if Greensboro had received an Enterprise Community grant:

Neighborhood Empowerment	$ 1,200,000
Small Business Development	$ 500,000
Substance Abuse and Other Key Health Issues	$ 400,000
Community Access to Services	$ 350,000
Mobile Educational Services	$ 150,000
Employment Support (child care and transportation)	$ 150,000
Substandard Housing Prevention	$ 100,000
Community Learning Centers	$ 100,000

While the goal of neighborhood empowerment received the lion's share of the funds in Greensboro's proposed budget, the task force was reluctant to design specific programs until a planning process could be put in place that involved residents. Past programs had failed, they reasoned, because this involvement was missing on the front end. They recognized that it would take time, but proposed building upon the neighborhood organizing work of groups such as the Greensboro City Wide Poor People's Organization, Project Greensboro, Project Homestead, Bennett College Community Development Corporation, and the Greensboro Episcopal Housing Ministry.

Greensboro has an enviable record in the area of affordable housing, yet the strategic plan recommended that these efforts be redoubled because of the growing need. The plan cited Eastside Park, a neighborhood revitalization project sponsored by Neighborhoods United of Greensboro, Inc., a coali-

tion of five Rotary Clubs, as a model for future neighborhood revitalization efforts. Neighborhoods United and the City of Greensboro partnered with nine nonprofits to renovate houses and provide the services needed to restore this once vibrant community. Substandard and boarded-up houses were another key community development issue in that they represent wasted resources and discourage home ownership and neighborhood revitalization. The plan points out the need for North Carolina enabling legislation that would give local housing inspectors more authority to correct housing conditions. Expanded and improved community policing was seen as the answer to neighborhood safety issues. Greensboro's pilot Police Neighborhood Resource Centers in four public housing communities has proven very successful and should be expanded. This program relies on communication and partnership building with neighborhood groups in fighting crime.

The education strategy basically calls for taking advantage of Greensboro's wealth of educational resources, from its public school system to its five colleges and universities, as well as Guilford Technical Community College. The strategy emphasizes mentoring and supportive services for young children to help them before they have problems in school. It also includes the creation of accessible and non-structured environments where young people and adults can be exposed to new technologies and information tools and can seek career guidance. Education Committee members were especially interested in the role of technology, hence the recommendation for mobile learning services, such as the Tech Mobile or Computer Mobile. The plan recognizes the Chavis Lifelong Learning Library as a model for community resource centers. At Chavis, a branch library in the proposed EC area, a coalition of 60 organizations work to promote reading and literacy and provide an array of supportive educational services.

Human service strategies focused on fixing programs that have built-in disincentives to self-sufficiency or that actually encourage dependency. For example, in some instances welfare benefits can be lost during job training or before the individual has become self-sufficient. Accessibility to services was also identified as an issue. However, when it was suggested that outreach facilities be placed in the EC neighborhoods, residents objected strenuously that they would further stigmatize their neighborhoods and hurt revitalization efforts. From that point the focus shifted to information about services, transportation and access to services, and affordability. The plan recommends that human service information be compiled, along with information about housing, job training, child care, transportation, and more, and be distributed to residents. A computerized Community Information Network could be operated from resource centers located in existing neighborhood facilities such as libraries or recreation centers. Other parts of the human service strategy include a coordinated application system for all human services, and training for neighborhood residents to operate affordable day care, transportation, and other services. The final piece of the human services strategy is to address the special needs of youth and the elderly, and to involve them in planning, developing, and implementing solutions.

The Future

Although Greensboro was not awarded an EC grant, a number of activities are underway that are either directly or indirectly related to the strategic planning process:

Consolidated Planning and the Community Resource Board

The City's Consolidated Planning process began shortly after the EC application project and built upon the strategic plan. The Consolidated Plan pulls together three Federal programs and two locally-funded programs administered by the Department of Housing and Community Development in a comprehensive and integrated strategy to address the needs of all the city's neighborhoods. The cornerstone is a five-year strategic plan that continues the neighborhood-based planning strategy that was launched by the Enterprise Community initiative. The primary goals are to build the problem-solving capacity of neighborhood organizations in order to bring all of the community's resources to bear in addressing these problems. The plan is predicated upon collaboration between educational institutions, human service agencies, nonprofit organizations, churches, City and County departments, and charitable organizations. The Community Resource Board (CRB) was created in 1995 to make recommendations to the City Council regarding the allocation of housing and community development resources. Conceived in a climate of heightened competition, the CRB is responsible for ensuring that increasingly limited resources are used as efficiently as possible and are allocated equitably.

Mayor's Committee on Community Economic Development

In the winter of 1995, Greensboro was invited to participate in the National League of Cities' Urban Poverty and Cities Initiative, an experiment in team building to enable communities to create public-private partnerships. A team from Greensboro composed of city staff and community leaders attended a workshop hosted by the League and the City of Charlotte, along with teams from Boston, Little Rock, and Oklahoma City. That experience led to the creation of the Mayor's Committee on Community Economic Development. The stated goal of this committee is "to create the public will that is essential in order to begin the task of addressing the economic needs of neighborhoods. This partnership must include corporate as well as community leaders working collaboratively to link residents of poor neighborhoods with the economic resources of our community." Over the last year the committee has been working on a strategy to engage the business and corporate leadership in a neighborhood economic development program by convincing them that the well-being of the entire community is jeopardized when even one neighborhood suffers from poverty.

Community Information Broker Project

Because Greensboro submitted an EC application, the City was invited to participate in a unique telecommunications study called the Community Information Broker project sponsored by the Department of Commerce and the North Carolina Client and Community Development Center. The project is exploring ways that telecommunications and the information highway can assist communities in implementing their EC strategic plans. The premise is that residents of poor neighborhoods do not share in the economic benefits of electronic networking and other telecommunications technologies. The project is testing a new model—community information brokers. These are individuals who would serve as networking intermediaries for their communities. They would demonstrate the potential of the information highway to enhance the capacity of organizations and agencies that serve residents of poor neighborhoods, since this technology is usually beyond their reach. The project was a good fit for Greensboro since the EC strategic plan emphasized the potential of computer technology and the information highway to create economic opportunity for EC residents.

Statewide Networking

Greensboro is participating in a networking initiative of the North Carolina Division of Community Assistance for EC applicant communities. The Division, which is part of the North Carolina Department of Commerce, played a key role in the application process for the state's Enterprise Community applicants. Division staff continue to look for ways to help unsuccessful EC applicants implement their strategic plans using other resources. The Division has hosted several meetings (some via teleconference) where staff from the various communities can exchange information about progress they have made in implementing their strategic plans, and they can learn about other federal and state programs. Currently, the Division of Community Assistance is partnering with the University of North Carolina Center for Urban and Regional Studies on a grant proposal on behalf of the state's EC cities to the Environmental Protection Agency's Brownfields Economic Redevelopment Initiative. The project will study the economic redevelopment potential of contaminated, vacant, or underutilized sites in center city neighborhoods. The project will focus on sites that could have economic development benefits for residents of EC neighborhoods.

Summary

Although Greensboro was not one of the cities awarded an Enterprise Community grant, the city benefited from applying. City planners now have an action plan for the economic revitalization of poor neighborhoods that can serve the community for years to come. At its heart is the concept of helping people to help themselves. With this plan in hand, community-based organizations and residents can seek assistance for their neighborhoods from any number of sources. Many of the recommendations in the plan are very practical solutions to neighborhood problems that do not necessarily cost a lot of money, such as seeking stronger housing code legislation. The EC strategic planning process demonstrated the advantages of collaboration and was a catalyst for the formation of an informal coalition of neighborhood organizations and residents. Most importantly, this partnership includes local government departments and agencies as well as the leadership of the private sector. CP

Residential Segregation in North Carolina

Lance Freeman

When blacks and whites reacted so differently to the verdict of the O.J. Simpson trial, many observers commented that it was almost as though the two races inhabited two different worlds. Unfortunately, this comment is not as much an exaggeration as many would think. Although blacks are increasingly present in corporate America, the entertainment industry, politics, and other spheres of public life, blacks and whites for the most part still live in separate residential communities. Research by social scientists has found that levels of residential segregation (hereafter referred to as segregation) between blacks and whites remained high in most metropolitan regions as of 1990 (Farley and Frey 1994). This is true even though more than a quarter of a century has elapsed since the passage of the 1968 Fair Housing Act.

This article discusses the causes and consequences of segregation. Data is presented to illustrate segregation levels in North Carolina by county, based on the 1990 census. To conclude, the article discusses the policy implications of segregation.

The Causes of Residential Segregation

Social scientists have long noted that different groups sort themselves spatially in modern industrialized societies. This pattern is evident not only between blacks and whites, but among other ethnic groups and people sharing similar lifestyles. Based on this spatial differentiation, certain social scientists have postulated that spatial relations reflect the social relations of society (Park 1926). Social relations here refer to the socioeconomic status and cultures of different groups and the extent to which minority groups are assimilated into the majority society. The fundamental cause of segregation between blacks and whites is the continued social chasm that exists between these two groups. This social distance is manifested spatially through three mechanisms.

One mechanism is the economic inequality between blacks and whites, which affects the types of housing each group can afford. Given that housing itself is somewhat segregated by price and tenure type, the disparities in the economic resources of blacks and whites should translate into a certain degree of segregation. Black households have a median household income that is only 62% of the median household income of whites, and the median net worth of black households is only 8% of the median net worth of white households (Oliver and Shapiro 1995, 86). Such large differences in financial resources make it difficult for many blacks to move into more expensive neighborhoods. Because housing is typically more expensive in largely white neighborhoods, it may be more difficult for many blacks to qualify for a loan in white neighborhoods or to be able to afford the higher rental prices in those areas. In a study of impediments to fair housing in North Carolina, the lack of affordable housing in many neighborhoods was often cited as restricting the options of low income minorities (Basolo *et al.* 1996).

Research, however, has found that high income blacks tend to be just as segregated from whites as low income blacks (Farley 1995; Farley 1990; Farley *et al.* 1993; Massey and Denton 1988b). Although income is not a complete measure of economic resources, this does suggest that economic disparities

***Lance Freeman** is a doctoral condidate at the Department of City and Regional Planning of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.* *The data utilized in this article were originally presented in a report prepared for the North Carolina Institute of Minority Economic Development.*

may not play a very important role in causing segregation..

A second force leading to high levels of segregation between blacks and whites is the different preferences they have in terms of the ideal racial composition of their neighborhoods. Survey evidence from the Detroit Area Study, for example, suggests that the majority of whites prefer neighborhoods that have a relatively small black presence. This same evidence indicates that blacks prefer neighborhoods that are about 50% to 75% black (Farley *et al.* 1993). What this means is that a neighborhood that is attractive to many blacks, one with a substantial black presence, is likely to draw a disproportionate amount of black in-movers. This same neighborhood, however, is likely to be unattractive to most whites, and few whites will move into the neighborhood, and those that are currently residing there are likely to move out. The end result is that the neighborhood is likely to become all black. This illustrates how neighborhoods can become racially homogenous even though neither whites nor blacks necessarily prefer neighborhoods that are completely homogenous (Schelling 1971).

Finally, housing discrimination is an important force that helps shape the residential patterns we observe today. Studies done by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in 1977 and 1988 show that blacks seeking housing face a high probability of receiving discriminatory treatment (Turner *et al.* 1991). Often this discriminatory treatment is in the form of steering whereby blacks are shown homes only in black areas, or where blacks are told no apartments are available when indeed there are.

Perhaps even more important than present discriminatory practices is the legacy of past housing discrimination. In addition to more subtle forms of discrimination such as steering, blatant and pervasive discrimination played a major role in creating segregated living patterns prior to the Civil Rights Era. Many houses sold by whites in the first half of this century had restrictive covenants that forbade parties to the agreement from selling these houses to blacks. Violence against blacks who moved into white neighborhoods served to deter blacks who might be persistent in knocking down discriminatory barriers (Massey and Denton 1993). Besides creating segregated communities that endure to this day, discriminatory practices of the past also helped shape the current preferences of blacks and whites. Many have grown up in racially homogeneous neighborhoods and hence may now feel uncomfortable living in an integrated setting. For example, many whites associate black neighborhoods with crime and deteriorated conditions, and many blacks assume they will be victims of hostile treatment in white neighborhoods (Farley *et al.* 1994) These preconceived notions have been shaped, in part, by the experiences of blacks and whites living in separate neighborhoods and the historically discriminatory practices that created these neighborhoods (Galster 1993).

These three forces—economic disparities, differences in preferences, and housing discrimination—continue to shape residential patterns today. The next section addresses the question of how these forces have manifested themselves in North Carolina by illustrating current levels of segregation in the state.

In general, the counties of North Carolina are highly segregated.

Residential Segregation in North Carolina: 1990

Table 1 presents segregation indexes for 99 counties in North Carolina derived from block level data from the 1990 census.[1] The two indexes used were the *dissimilarity index* and the *isolation index*. Although other measures of segregation exist, these two come closest to capturing the concept of segregation as it is most commonly used (Massey and Denton 1988a). The dissimilarity index indicates whether a particular group is evenly distributed over geographic units[2]. The dissimilarity index can take on values ranging from 0, representing perfect integration, to 1, representing complete segregation (Massey and Denton 1988a). One way of thinking about the value of the dissimilarity index is as representing the percentage of that group that would need to move to achieve complete integration. For example, Durham County has a dissimilarity score of .71, which means that 71% of the black population would have to move to achieve complete integration.

The isolation index attempts to gauge the experience of segregation as felt by each minority or majority member by telling the percentage black of the block inhabited by the average black person. Using

Table 1: Segregation Measures for North Carolina Counties

County	Dissimilarity	Isolation	Total	%Black	County	Dissimilarity	Isolation	Total	%Black
Alamance	0.73	0.66	108213	19.25%	Lee	0.72	0.67	41374	22.77%
Alexander	0.8	0.4	27544	6.14%	Lenoir	0.74	0.79	57274	39.45%
Alleghany	0.85	0.34	9590	2.01%	Lincoln	0.78	0.52	50319	8.08%
Anson	0.76	0.82	23474	47.31%	Macon *	0.92	0.59	23499	1.60%
Ashe *	0.91	0.21	22209	0.53%	Madison *	0.91	0.24	16953	0.68%
Avery *	0.88	0.16	14867	0.78%	Martin	0.69	0.76	25078	44.65%
Beaufort	0.78	0.77	42283	31.15%	McDowell	0.79	0.49	35681	3.88%
Bertie	0.72	0.85	20388	61.44%	Mecklenburg	0.73	0.72	511433	26.32%
Bladen	0.79	0.81	28663	39.20%	Mitchell *	0.9	0.18	14433	0.23%
Brunswick	0.8	0.69	50985	18.02%	Montgomery	0.83	0.76	23346	25.72%
Buncombe	0.8	0.58	174821	8.07%	Moore	0.8	0.72	59013	18.42%
Burke	0.78	0.42	75744	6.67%	Nash	0.69	0.68	76677	31.54%
Cabarrus	0.78	0.65	98935	12.98%	New Hanover	0.78	0.73	120284	19.98%
Caldwell	0.88	0.59	70709	5.54%	Northampton	0.7	0.83	20798	59.38%
Camden	0.65	0.6	5904	25.00%	Onslow	0.39	0.35	149838	19.88%
Carteret	0.77	0.59	52556	8.11%	Orange	0.61	0.45	93851	15.88%
Caswell	0.59	0.66	20693	40.90%	Pamlico	0.78	0.73	11372	25.91%
Catawba	0.77	0.58	118412	9.01%	Pasquotank	0.65	0.7	31298	37.10%
Chatam	0.69	0.61	38759	22.89%	Pender	0.74	0.73	28855	30.40%
Cherokee *	0.88	0.54	20170	1.84%	Perquimans	0.68	0.68	10447	32.74%
Chowan	0.73	0.75	13506	37.82%	Person	0.66	0.66	30180	30.14%
Clay *	0.91	0.1	7155	0.42%	Pitt	0.68	0.71	107924	33.34%
Cleveland	0.78	0.69	84714	20.96%	Polk	0.83	0.6	14416	7.28%
Columbus	0.74	0.73	49587	30.64%	Randolph	0.81	0.54	106546	5.80%
Craven	0.62	0.63	81613	25.83%	Richmond	0.77	0.75	44518	28.95%
Cumberland	0.5	0.56	274566	31.85%	Robeson	0.75	0.7	105179	24.94%
Currituck	0.68	0.42	13736	11.14%	Rockingham	0.68	0.59	86064	20.38%
Dare	0.87	0.52	22746	3.68%	Rowan	0.77	0.67	110605	15.99%
Davidson	0.82	0.62	126677	9.61%	Rutherford	0.77	0.57	56918	11.52%
Davie	0.68	0.42	27859	8.86%	Sampson	0.7	0.71	47297	33.21%
Duplin	0.74	0.74	39995	33.26%	Scotland	0.72	0.74	33754	36.16%
Durham	0.71	0.75	181835	37.18%	Stanly	0.89	0.8	51765	11.47%
Edgecombe	0.73	0.84	56558	56.05%	Stokes	0.83	0.56	37223	5.48%
Forsyth	0.75	0.73	265878	24.79%	Surry	0.82	0.46	61704	4.80%
Franklin	0.64	0.66	36414	35.36%	Swain *	0.67	0.75	11268	1.51%
Gaston	0.73	0.59	175093	12.85%	Transylvania	0.83	0.48	25520	4.66%
Gates	0.6	0.7	9305	45.08%	Tyrrell	0.8	0.82	3856	40.00%
Granville	0.64	0.7	38345	39.06%	Union	0.77	0.65	84211	15.95%
Greene	0.58	0.67	15384	42.36%	Vance	0.67	0.75	38892	45.16%
Guilford	0.73	0.71	347420	26.41%	Wake	0.65	0.6	423380	20.75%
Halifax	0.73	0.8	55516	49.61%	Warren	0.58	0.77	17265	57.17%
Harnett	0.67	0.62	67822	22.52%	Washington	0.67	0.75	13997	45.48%
Haywood *	0.89	0.36	46942	1.22%	Watauga	0.7	0.17	36952	2.14%
Henderson	0.86	0.56	69285	3.20%	Wayne	0.67	0.69	104666	32.32%
Hertford	0.74	0.84	22523	57.75%	Wilkes	0.82	0.88	59393	4.86%
Hoke	0.66	0.73	22856	43.12%	Wilson	0.72	0.76	66061	37.71%
Hyde	0.7	0.68	5411	33.00%	Yadkin	0.8	0.42	30488	4.31%
Iredell	0.74	0.62	92931	15.81%	Yancey *	0.95	0.32	15419	1.28%
Jackson *	0.73	0.17	26846	1.68%	Average	0.74	0.62		22.55%
Johnston	0.72	0.62	81306	17.72%	Median	0.74	0.66		20.96%
Jones	0.66	0.71	9414	39.05%	Std. Deviation	0.09	0.17		16.51%

* The dissimilarity index should be interpreted cautiously for counties that are less than 2% black.

NOTE: Graham County was excluded because only 1 black lived there in 1990.

Durham County as an example again, the average black person inhabits a block that is 75% black. This index depends in part on the relative size of the minority population. Thus, in a county where minorities make up a large portion of the population, the isolation index might be relatively high, even if minorities are evenly spread throughout the county[3]. Like the dissimilarity index, the isolation index ranges from 0 to 1, with 0 indicating the average black lives on a block with no other blacks, and one indicating the average black inhabits a block that is 100% black[4].

As a rule of thumb, segregation indexes between 0 and 0.3 are considered low, those between 0.3 and 0.6 moderate, and those above 0.6 are considered high (Kantrowitz 1973). The data presented in Table 1 suggests that in general, the counties of North Carolina are highly segregated. The mean score on the dissimilarity index is .74 and the mean score on the isolation index is 0.62, both of which fall in the high range. In fact, Caswell, Cumberland, Greene, Onslow, and Warren counties are the only counties that have dissimilarity scores below 0.6, the cutoff for the high range, and none of those are below 0.3, the cutoff for the low range.

Because residential segregation is caused in part by housing discrimination, segregation might be viewed as undesirable for that reason alone. But as will become apparent in the next section, residential segregation has been implicated in a number of social ills and exacerbates many of the social problems affecting blacks.

The Costs of Segregation

While both blacks and whites exhibit preferences for some degree of segregation, it is not without costs, particularly for blacks. Research has shown that the greatest impact of segregation on blacks is on their economic well-being, but segregation may also contribute to the creation of an urban underclass and lead to strained relations between the races.

Segregation is thought to negatively impact black economic well-being in a number of ways. For one, high levels of segregation lead to the creation of dual housing markets for blacks and whites. Because blacks are both poorer than whites and a smaller proportion of the population, demand for housing is lower in black neighborhoods than in white neighborhoods, and consequently property values are lower also. Studies have shown, for example, that similar housing is worth less in black neighborhoods than in white neighborhoods (Oliver and Shapiro 1995). While this does have the advantage of making housing more affordable in black neighborhoods, it also lessens the value of the equity that blacks have in their homes, leaving black homeowners with less wealth than white homeowners. A second way that segregation is thought to negatively affect black economic well being is through its impact on job opportunities. Employment growth in many regions is occurring away from concentrations of blacks (Kasarda 1985). This makes it more difficult for blacks to hear about jobs and more difficult for them to commute to jobs should they be hired. Comprehensive reviews of the evidence have found that this "spatial mismatch" does indeed negatively affect black employment opportunities (Holzer 1991; Kain 1992).

High levels of segregation have also been implicated in the creation of the urban underclass (Massey and Denton 1993). Because blacks have a significantly higher poverty rate than whites, segregation concentrates poverty into a few black neighborhoods. Along with concentrating poverty, segregation concentrates and exacerbates the social ills associated with poverty, such as high levels of crime, welfare dependency, out of wedlock child bearing, and drug abuse. The very concentration of such problems makes them worse.

Finally, segregation may worsen already strained relations between the races. While segregation may reflect the social relations between blacks and whites, it may also contribute to the deterioration of these relations. Growing up and living in separate neighborhoods may foster the tendency of whites and blacks to look at the other group as "them" as opposed to "us." Earlier research has shown that in certain circumstances, increased contact between blacks and whites may lessen racial hostilities (Helper 1986; Yinger 1986a).

There are, of course, benefits for blacks in living in a segregated environment. It may be easier to develop social, religious and cultural institutions that cater to black needs when there are relatively high concentrations of blacks. Black political representation also benefits when blacks are concentrated in certain areas. It seems unlikely, however, that these benefits outweigh the negative consequences of segregation, although it would be difficult to argue this point empirically.

Policy Implications

What should the policy response be to the high levels of segregation that exist in North Carolina? Certainly the rigorous enforcement of fair housing laws is necessary. The choice to live in any community one can afford is no longer considered a controversial issue. Thus, one policy response would be to strengthen efforts to enforce existing antidiscrimination laws. Because overt discrimination has declined significantly, aggressive actions such as testing are necessary to detect discrimination. Testing pairs white and black auditors with similar characteristics and has them both seek housing. If the black auditor is treated worse than the white auditor, this provides evidence of discrimination. Testing can be expensive and requires some expertise to implement effectively, and funding from the state and federal levels is likely to be necessary to assist local community organizations that conduct testing, such as the North Carolina Fair Housing Center.

Simply enforcing antidiscrimination laws, however, will not guarantee integration. Many whites have come to associate significant black entry into any neighborhood with unavoidable racial turnover and neighborhood decline (Farley *et al.* 1994). To counter these stereotypes, it may be necessary for policy makers to actively intervene in some cases in order to promote and maintain integration. Examples of such policies include reverse steering by realtors, whereby blacks and whites are shown homes in neighborhoods where they are underrepresented; financial incentives for blacks or whites moving into neighborhoods where they are underrepresented; equity assurance programs that guarantee the property values of homes, used to dampen the fear that property values will decline when blacks move in; bans on for sale signs that are suggestive of racial turnover; and scatter site public housing and vouchers that seek to disperse minority recipients of housing assistance into white neighborhoods (Chandler 1992). In addition, communities attempting to maintain integrated neighborhoods will want to insure that public services, especially schools, are maintained and strengthened.

Given the current political climate and the budgetary constraints existing at all levels of government, the likelihood of implementing these programs in North Carolina may seem low. For example, although several local communities are willing to implement inclusionary zoning programs, they have been unable to get permission from the state legislature.

However, some localities have successfully implemented such strategies and have maintained racially integrated communities. Shaker Heights, Ohio, is an example of a community that has successfully employed some of the strategies described above (Galster 1993). Oak Park, Illinois, is another example of such a community (Saltman 1990). The proposed Eno Commons co-housing development in Durham is a local example of a new development where steps are being taken to acheive a racially diverse community by marketing the development to African Americans as well as to whites[5]. But even with the successful implementation of pro-integrative policies, many blacks may be left behind. Given the large disparities in economic resources between blacks and whites, many blacks simply will not be able to afford homes in more expensive white neighborhoods. In addition, the widespread integration of poorer blacks into white neighborhoods is unlikely to be popular and would probably lead to white flight from those neighborhoods.

The continued segregation of blacks and whites reflects the continued socioeconomic chasm between these two groups and points to a need to bridge these differences.

The fact that fair housing laws and pro-integrative policies are limited in effect, no matter how rigorously they are implemented, points to the ultimate causes of segregation in America. The notion that spatial relations reflect social relations seems especially apt. The continued segregation of blacks and whites reflects the continued socioeconomic chasm between these two groups and points to a need to bridge these differences. Housing policy alone is not sufficient to create integrated communities, and focusing on housing policy as a way to reduce segregation in some ways puts the cart before the horse. This suggests that we should also focus on other arenas such as education and employement if we wish to create an integrated society.

Although it is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss these in detail, policies that would reduce the social and economic disparities separating blacks and whites would also lead to more integrated communities. Thus, programs such as Smart Start, which aims to improve educational acheivement among disadvantaged youth, may also indirectly serve to reduce segregation in future generations by improving the status of disadvantaged youth who are disproportionately African American. Continuing to combat labor market discrimination is important as well to ensure equal opportunity for all. By reducing the socioeconomic disparities between blacks and whites, not only will more blacks be able to live in more expensive white neighborhoods, but the class differentials that contribute to stereotypes and prejudice between the two groups will be reduced as well. It is these stereotypes that contribute to housing discrimination and white flight. In addition, improving black socioeconomic status will also lead to improved black neighborhoods, giving more blacks the option to live in stable black communities. Indeed, this has been the experience of other racial and ethnic minorities. As these groups have socially and economically assimilated into the American mainstream, they have spatially assimilated as well (Massey 1985). Presently, blacks experience far higher levels of segregation than Asians or Latinos (Farley and Frey 1993).

Conclusion

Blacks and whites in North Carolina often live in separate communities due to the economic disparities between them, the preferences of blacks and whites, and continuing discrimination. Research evidence suggests that high levels of segregation, such as those existing in North Carolina, may be detrimental to black economic well being. This fact, coupled with the contribution of illegal discrimination to segregation, calls for a policy response to address this problem. Fair housing laws as well as policies that actively seek to promote housing integration offer one response to continued housing segregation. But housing policies aimed at reducing segregation are likely to be insufficient, for they do not change the underlying social relations that create segregation in the first place. As such, they are unlikely to substantially reduce segregation.

This calls for a need to affect the social and economic relations of whites and blacks if we hope to create a truly integrated society. Only when this is achieved will the persistently high levels of segregation experienced by blacks be reduced. CP

Endnotes

1. Graham County was not included because only one black resided there in 1990.

2. The formula used to calculate the dissimilarity index is:

$$D = .5\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| b_i/B - w_i/W \right|$$

where b_i is the black population in block i, w_i is the white population in block i, and B and W are the black and white populations of the county, respectively (Massey and Denton 1988a)

3. An example may help to clarify this non-intuitive point. Take a city that is 90% black and composed of 10 blocks. Blacks couple be spread even throughout the city, making up 90% of each block, thus yeilding a score of zero on the dissimilarity index. The isolation index, however, would be .9, which is fairly high.

4. The formula used to calculate the isolation index is:

$$bPb = \sum_{i=1}^{n} [b_i/B]\ [b_i/t_i]$$

where bPb is the probability that a reandomly drawn black shares a block with another black, b_i is the number of blacks, and t_i the total poulation of block i, and B is the total black population in the county.

5. In co-housing developments, residents share common space such as kitchens, laundry, and recreational facilities.

References

Basolo, Victoria, Margrit Bergholz, Lance Freeman, and Bill Rohe. 1996. *A Study of Impediments to Fair Housing in North Carolina.* Chapel Hill: Center for Urban and Regional Studies.

Chandler, Mittie O. 1992. "Obstacles to Housing Integration Program Efforts." In *The Metropolis in Black and White*. Edited by George C. Galster Edward W. Hill New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Farley, John. 1995. "Race Still Matters." *Urban Affairs Review* 31:244-54.

Farley, Reynolds. 1990. "Residential Segregation of Social and Economic Groups among Blacks, 1970-1980." Pp.274-298 in *The Urban Underclass*. eds. Christopher

Jencks and Paul Peterson. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Farley, Reynolds, and William H. Frey. 1994. "Changes in the Segregation of Whites from Blacks during the 1980s: Small Steps toward a More Racially Integrated Society." *American Sociological Review* 59: 23-45.

———. 1993. "Latino, Asian, and Black Segregation in Multi-Ethnic Metro Areas: Findings from the 1990 Census." *Research Reports*, No. 93-278. Ann Arbor: Population Studies Center, University of Michigan.

Farley, Reynolds, Charlotte Steeh, Tara Jackson, Maria Krysan, and Keith Reeves. 1993. "Continued Racial Segregation in Detroit: 'Chocolate City Vanilla Suburbs' Revisited." *Journal of Housing Research* 1:1-38.

———. 1994. "Stereotypes and Segregation: Neighborhoods in the Detroit Area." *American Journal of Sociology* 100:750-80.

Galster, George. 1992. "The Case for Racial Integration." In *The Metropolis in Black and White,* edited by George Galster and Edward Hill. New Brunswick: Center for Urban Policy and Research.

Helper, Rose. 1986. "Success and Resistance Factors in the Maintenance of Racially Mixed Neighborhoods. In *Housing Segregation and Federal Policy,* edited by John Goering. Chapel Hill: University of Chapel Hill Press.

Holzer, Harry J. 1991. The Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis: What Has the Evidence Shown?" *Urban Studies* 28:105-22.

Kain, John. 1992. "The Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis: Three Decades Later." *Housing Policy Debate* 2:371-460

Kantrowitz, Nathan. 1973. *Ethnic and Racial Segregation in the New York Metropolis*. New York: Praeger.

Kasarda, John D. 1985. "Urban Change and Change and Minority Opportunity," Pp 33-67. *The New Urban Reality*. Edited by Paul Peterson. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Massey, Douglas S. 1985. "Ethnic Residential Segregation: A Theoretical Synthesis and Empirical Review." *Sociology and Social Research*. 69: 315-350.

Massey, Douglas S. and Denton, Nancy A. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1988a. "The dimensions of residential segregation." *Social Forces* 67:281-315.

———. 1988b. "Residential Segregation of Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians by Socioeconomic Status and Generation." *Social Science Quarterly* 69:797-818.

Oliver, Melvin L., and Thomas M. Shapiro. 1995. *Black Wealth/White Wealth*. New York: Routledge.

Park, Robert E. 1926. "The Urban Community as a Spatial Pattern and a moral order." In ed. E.W. Burgess, *The Urban Community.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Saltman, Juliet. 1990. *A Fragile Movement.*

Schelling, Thomas C. 1971. "Dynamic Models of Segregation." *Journal of Mathematical Sociology* 1:143-86.

Turner, Margery, Raymond Struyk, and John Yinger. 1991. *Housing Discrimination Study: Synthesis*. Washington D.C.: Urban Institute/U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Yinger, John. 1986. "On the Possibility of Acheiving Racial Integration through Subsidized Housing. In *Housing Segregation and Federal Policy,* edited by John Goering. Chapel Hill: University of Chapel Hill Press.

"Micro" Enterprise Development: Building Businesses from the Bottom Up

David E. Buchholz

Debby Deter did not set out to be an entrepreneur. It just happened that way. Debby was struggling to make ends meet, working several jobs in the food industry. One of them was with her friend Mari, who had started a catering business. "When she catered special occasions, she wanted to rent nice tablecloths, but the companies doing that were very unreliable. So I said, 'Well, shoot, I can do that!'" Thus began Serviette Service.

Starting the business in her home, Debby found several interested customers. But she did not have the cash to buy new tablecloths. Banks would not help her because the loan amounts she needed were too small to "justify the paperwork." She also needed help with marketing and accounting, but could not afford to hire professionals. It was a struggle to get the business off the ground.

Three years later, Debby was still struggling when she got a call from Mari. "Mari said, 'Deb, I think I've finally found the answer to our problems,'" Debby recalls. She had just learned about a new program that "promised help with the exact problems we had." Debby and Mari joined Good Work, a program which offered them access to loan capital, business training, technical assistance, and ongoing peer support. "There was this exchange of energy right off the bat. None of us had money, but we could share the same concerns. We started learning and kept learning all the time."

Debby's business has grown exponentially, and she has opened a second business selling handmade birdhouses. She has refinanced her home and reduced her debt load. She has used four business loans with Good Work to buy inventory, build storage facilities, and get a truck. She is now setting her sights on an even bigger goal, opening an inn and a restaurant.

"A friend of mine started a business about the same time I did," Debby says. "Because of the support I get in this program, I'm probably five years ahead of her now. She gets overwhelmed, and doesn't know where to turn for help. She's still struggling with questions that I had answered long ago." Debby labels lack of capital as a "huge" problem for small businesses, but also thinks learning and support are critical. "How many small businesses fail? Some may have the money, but they don't have the knowledge to succeed. Good Work not only gives us access to the capital, but also gives us the chance to learn from the experience."

The Need for Microbusiness Development

Most businesses, regardless of size, share Debby's needs: start-up and operating capital until the business is profitable (often a period of years), management and technical expertise, and social and business support structures which provide encouragement, networking, and problem-solving. This is particularly true for "microbusinesses," enterprises which begin very small and usually have fewer than five employees. Many entrepreneurs are able to succeed because they begin with these resources or at least have the means to pay for them.

This is not true, however, for everyone with a good business idea. Lower income people commonly lack these critical resources. Debby knew how to make tablecloths and had the drive and energy to succeed, but did not have the capital, the management expertise, or the peer support she needed. Without

David E. Buchholz *is the Executive Director of Good Work, Inc. Good Work was one of eleven recipients nationwide of the 1996 Harry Chapin Self-Reliance Awards.*

assistance, she might have become one of the millions of business "failures" each year in the United States.

Many people like Debby have the potential to succeed at self-employment but are limited by this scarcity of resources. This is particularly critical when it comes to investable finances. Without substantial personal or family assets to invest or borrow against, it is much harder to get a business off the ground. Historically, this has been especially true for women and minorities, as illustrated by the following facts:

- African-Americans have an average net worth about 8% that of whites (Oliver and Shapiro 1995, 86).[1]
- 79% of black households, more than double the rate for white households, do not have a sufficient safety net to survive at the poverty line for three months (*ibid*, 88).
- About three-fourths of all African-American children (nearly double the rate of whites) grow up in households possessing no financial assets (*ibid*, 90).
- Females have significantly lower incomes and net assets than males, and female-owned businesses begin with half the capital of male-owned firms (NC Equity 1991, 5-25; U.S. DOC 1989).

This lack of investable capital seriously undermines the ability of new enterprises to get off the ground. The primary financial alternative—a bank loan—is often unavailable to newer businesses. A 1991 study by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology showed that 73 percent of businesses funded their start-up needs through personal savings, while almost none utilized banks (Roberts 1991). Banks rarely find what they are looking for in microbusinesses: flawless credit, highly secured and liquid collateral, a business track record of three to five years, and a highly polished business plan that speaks their language. Furthermore, $1,000 to $20,000 needed to capitalize many ventures is, ironically, much too small to be profitable to commercial lenders. As the North Carolina Institute for Minority Economic Development put it:

> Banks are traditionally conservative and are averse to doing business with new or small businesses requiring small loans or loans with longer repayment periods. The high transaction costs involved in such loans may make it economically unattractive for the lender. Lending institutions usually evaluate a potential customer's credit risks using the three "C's"—collateral, character, and credit. [Minority-owned businesses] are usually weak on collateral, their character is unfamiliar to bankers and they haven't had the opportunity to establish credit (NC Institute for Minority Economic Development 1994).

This often proves to be a "chicken and egg" problem. Without capital with which to begin, lower income entrepreneurs cannot invest in their businesses (which would build capital). And without capital, they cannot borrow from traditional lenders.

In addition, lower income people often lack the technical expertise and support which is critical to turn a good business idea into a profitable venture. A shortage of cash to hire accountants, lawyers, and other professionals further exacerbates this information gap. The lack of capital, business expertise, and support represents a significant handicap. Without specialized assistance, many potentially successful entrepreneurs will fail.



Debby Deter started a second business selling handmade birdhouses from the North Carolina mountains.

Learning From the "Third World"

In the 1980s, community leaders began searching for new models to assist low-income populations. For decades, various poverty alleviation strategies had focused on income supplements which were essentially redistributive. These strategies were very successful in ameliorating the worst excesses of poverty in the United States, but failed to make systemic changes which would enable the poor to move beyond subsistence. Attention thus shifted to models which promised "capacity building" economic development. These positive sum strategies focused on increasing the economic pie rather than simply changing the way it was distributed.

Small business creation was one strategy which offered several benefits at the same time. Small businesses can provide income, create jobs, provide training, build assets, and nurture hope and empowerment in low-income communities. Although self-employment offered such clear benefits, it was often difficult for lower income entrepreneurs to succeed for the reasons cited above. In developing programs to address these obstacles, program planners began looking at successful models from overseas.

The powerful examples of microbusiness programs in the developing world were hard to ignore. Programs in impoverished countries were showing dramatic increases in income, assets, and savings. The largest and best known program, the Grameen Bank, began in Bangladesh in 1976. The founder, a U.S.-trained Bangladeshi, recognized the potential and the obstacles for poor entrepreneurs in his country. Grameen began making tiny loans averaging $40 to women who worked extremely hard but just barely made ends meet. An infusion of capital, even a small one, enabled borrowers to buy labor-saving equipment, purchase materials in bulk, or buy things that they had only been able to rent before.

The loans were made in "peer groups" which acted as loan committees and social support structures. Borrowers were accountable to one another, and were ready with assistance—and pressure—when needed. Grameen met a major need and grew tremendously. It not only offered loans but encouraged savings, promoted gender equity in a male-dominated society, and pushed public health and education reforms among its participants. By the mid-1990s, the Grameen Bank had 1.7 million members, a 98% loan repayment rate, and billions of dollars in money lent and saved.

The success of the Grameen Bank was not lost on others in the developing world. Similar programs popped up in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, some of which developed remarkable track records of their own. Eventually, organizers began adapting the same basic model to impoverished areas in more affluent countries. In 1987, there were about ten microbusiness programs in the United States. By 1993, the number had ballooned to about 200 (Self-Employment Learning Project 1994). Since then, the number of U.S. programs has grown even more sharply.

One Local Response: Good Work

In 1991, community activists in Durham, North Carolina, began searching for ways to build local economic opportunities. They wanted to do this in a way that could reach people from different racial, economic, and educational backgrounds. With a few Grameen-type programs as models, they founded Good Work, Inc. Securing $100,000 in loan capital from the Self-Help Credit Union, they developed a peer lending program tailored to local needs. Debby, Mari, and about a dozen others formed the nucleus for Good Work's membership.

Good Work emerged in a local economy which appeared quite vibrant. With major research universities, renowned medical centers, and high-tech firms, the "Research Triangle" area of Durham, Raleigh, and Chapel Hill benefited from high and sustained growth in the 1980s and 1990s. The median income was roughly double that of the national average, the area had one of the highest concentration of Ph.D.'s in the country, and the unemployment rate was consistently in the low single digits.

Yet, like much of the nation, the local economy was becoming increasingly two-tiered. For those without advanced degrees, the economic growth was largely in the service sector, which offered low pay,

National Results (Aspen Institute 1994):
- Over 200 programs
- Over 55,000 businesses assisted
- Over $44 million in loans

Good Work Results:
- 98% business survival
- 100% loan repayment
- Over $1.8 million in local income generated in 1995



Good Work members at a training session.

few benefits, and little job security. The disparity between the "good" and "bad" jobs grew, and pockets of poverty deepened.[2] Despite generally high growth, whole sectors of the community were being left behind.

Good Work was offered as a viable economic development strategy in areas where few existed. Motivated individuals who dreamed of success could work with others to turn those dreams into reality. Good Work targeted individuals who most needed the program—low income persons, minorities, and women—but remained open to any potential entrepreneur. From the outset, this led to a program which brought together entrepreneurs from different backgrounds. This, in turn, led to a synergy of ideas and support which made the program particularly strong.

By early 1996, some 130 entrepreneurs had become full-fledged "members" of Good Work, and thousands of others had taken advantage of other training and assistance. Over time, the program developed a local reputation of helping those that could not find assistance elsewhere. As Governor James Hunt put it, "For many of these business owners, Good Work is the only means by which their business potential can be fulfilled."

Thanks to growing assistance through the program, 98% of members and alumni are still in business. Although all of Good Work's loans are considered too risky or unprofitable for banks, they have a repayment rate of 100%. Good Work has begun working with local banks to gain access to greater amounts of loan capital for expanding businesses.

A Comprehensive Approach

Many microbusiness programs, including Good Work, have concluded that there is no single"key" to making businesses succeed. Rather, successful programs have provided an integrated set of resources to entrepreneurs, either in-house or through cooperation with existing organizations. The balance of loan capital, technical expertise, and peer support provides flexible assistance to entrepreneurs. Through partnerships and peer participation, substantial support can be offered while keeping the program efficient. Good Work's program combines several features:

Outreach. To be effective, microbusiness programs normally commit substantial resources to proactively seek potential clients in low income communities. Lacking big advertising budgets, programs like Good Work partner with community groups, churches, small business agencies, minority business associations, public housing councils, and the like. Most outreach and training is done at homes, businesses, and community centers. This first step is critical to overcoming the common perception that lenders and assistance programs will not help microbusinesses.

Access to Loan Capital. All small businesses need capital to get off the ground, but many needs go unmet by banks. Good Work provides "high risk" loans that the banks cannot or will not make. As the Federal Reserve Bank noted in 1995, "Good Work has made [loans] that range from $500 to $10,000. Business loans of this type are nearly impossible to get through the bank for microbusinesses due to lack of collateral, credit problems, age of the business, or because they are considered unprofitable by banks" (Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond 1990, 130). As of early 1996, Good Work had made over 70 loans with no defaults. Members are also assisted with problems

such as credit, planning, financial analysis, and so on, that limit their ability to obtain traditional loans.

Business Training. Up-front business training is critical to entrepreneurs who have had little exposure to formal business concepts. While training sometimes exists in the community, it often either assumes familiarity with business terminology and concepts, or is taught in a formal lecture-style format which gives participants few practical skills. After several years of experimentation, Good Work designed a highly effective training curriculum called *Building Your Business*™. The training is hands-on, honing participants' nuts-and-bolts business skills. The interactive workshops cover such fundamentals as budgeting, cash flow, licensing, marketing, hiring, and business planning. A waiting list often forms for the training, which is now being used under license by other microbusiness programs around the country.

Loan Circle Orientation. Following the course, participants continue with training in their peer groups (called Loan Circles). This training offers participants feedback and advice on their businesses. Participants travel to one another's homes or places of businesses and review their financial and other information. They also organize their Circle, write by-laws, choose a name, and elect officers.

Center and Network Meetings. Good Work members meet every month. Upon entering the program, members join a "Center," at which they network with and advise one another. Outside speakers offer training in such issues as goal setting, tax planning, marketing techniques, business communication, legal protection, bank expectations, and so on. After cycling through the year-long training, members graduate into the "Network." The program for the Network is developed by the members.

Mentoring. Senior Good Work members, eager to give back to new participants, become mentors for new Good Work members. Having walked in their shoes, they are able to help them not only with business issues, but with guiding them through Good Work's program.

One-On-One Consulting. Good Work provides individualized consulting as an important component of membership. This one-on-one assistance has helped the program respond to the individual needs of businesses which are struggling or planning for growth. Members seek assistance in writing business plans, doing market research, expanding their markets, and the like.

In 1995, two evaluations were done through the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill's Department of City and Regional Planning. The results showed that among Good Work's member businesses:

- They had an average revenue increase of 492% since joining Good Work
- They had an average profit increase of 217% since joining Good Work
- 82% reported that Good Work had helped "significantly" or "very much" with their overall business skills
- Between 71% and 82% had "improved" or "greatly improved" their self-confidence, ability to face challenges, sense of belonging to a community, and sense of personal fulfillment
- 87% rated Good Work's program overall as "excellent" or "very good"
- 92% said they were "committed" or "strongly committed" to Good Work
- 100% would recommend Good Work to a friend who was starting a small business

Volunteer Technical Assistance. Good Work relies heavily on community partners to make the program more effective. Good Work operates a Volunteer Technical Assistance Program, tapping the energies of business owners, accountants, lawyers, and marketing experts who meet one-on-one with Good Work members. This program acts as a critical supplement to in-house consulting.

Successful microbusiness programs do more than provide loan checks, they also offer a comprehensive program to support participants. Beverly El-Amin, an early Good Work member, says the integrated approach helped her develop her career consulting business, which now does work nationally:

> As a minority, female entrepreneur I have benefited greatly from my affiliation with Good Work. The financial and technical support I have received from this organization is God-sent. Since becoming a member, I have applied for, received, and paid back three business loans, and am now paying back a fourth. Good Work has done and continues to do what commercial lending institutions have refused to do—give me a chance. The technical assistance I have received has helped me develop competence in developing a business plan, cash flow sheets, marketing plans, market research, taxes, and much mo
> My confidence in my ability to operate a business is strong. Income generated from my business has tripled since 1993. Without Good Work's assistance this would not have happened. They help people others won't.

Challenges for the Future

Good Work, and programs like it, have celebrated some tremendous successes. Often working on a shoestring, microbusiness development programs have nonetheless been able to assist entrepreneurs who, statistics tell us, would likely have gone out of business otherwise. These businesses have increased incomes, built assets, created jobs, and developed leadership and self-confidence skills among participants and their families.

Despite the successe microbusiness development pr grams face many challenges. A scarcity of operating support and loan capital hampers the ability of nonprofits to keep such programs operational. Regulations in some areas which discourage home-based businesses and which effectively prohibit welfare recipients from building a business safety net put additional obstacles in the way of participants. The ability of programs to deliver high-quality services while keeping costs for such services minimal will also be an important challenge for programs in cost-cutting times.

The potential of the field is also limited by the perception that these "little" businesses generate such small levels of economic activity that they are not taken seriously as a tool for economic development. In fact, the activity of entrepreneurs like Debby and Beverly has generated far more growth in the last decade than have "downsizing" corporations. Yet it is harder to visualize the community impact of their combined businesses than the impact of a newly relocated factory.

Much public policy by states and local communities continues to focus on high visibility projects, such as luring in large corporations with tax abatements and other incentives, which are essentially



Cynthia Williams-Hills opened a 24-hour child care business in her home.

"zero sum." Subsidized industrial recruitment is redistributive at its base, pitting one needy community against another. It is also increasingly expensive. Tax costs for corporate incentives have risen dramatically for subsidized industrial recruitment, with some recent deals costing over $150,000 per job created (Schweke *et al.* 1994, 23).[3]

On the other hand, capacity-building strategies like microbusiness development have the potential to develop local economies without simply displac-

ing the problem from one community to another. While they often lack the glamour found at the ribbon-cutting of a new plant, the economic sum of thousands of home-grown businesses is an investment which can improve the whole community. This broader view of what constitutes "economic development" is challenging precisely because it is more complicated. Yet, just as we learned that redistribution on an individual level has its limitations, we must also learn that redistributing the benefits of industry from one community to the next has its limitations as well.

Meanwhile, the entrepreneurs forge ahead. Their visions, dreams, and hard work will continue to move their families and communities forward. With the support of microbusiness development programs, more people like Debby and Beverly will continue to succeed.

"I discovered that if no one's there teaching you, if no one's there struggling with you, then you're not going to build your business on a solid foundation," says Cynthia Williams-Hills. Before launching Genesis I Day Care, she was working long hours away from home to provide for her family. "I was working as an administrative assistant and waiting tables. But I knew I had to make a change. My son cried every morning and work was getting bad. My mentor convinced me that I could make it in business, and she sent me to Good Work." Because of her love for children, Cynthia decided to open a child care business in her home.

Cynthia's idea—the area's first 24-hour child care business—filled a void in the market. "I had the idea, but when I got into it, I discovered it wasn't that simple. I needed money, and I needed to build my skills. Good Work helped me learn about budgeting and advertising. And with my credit at the time, no one else would give me a loan." Cynthia planned for months and officially launched her business in 1995.

Today, Cynthia cares for 27 children over three shifts, seven days a week. Besides herself, she employs four people full-time. Pending an upcoming licensing review, she plans to be in a new house soon, renovating her current one to care for more children. By mid-1996, she expects Genesis I to care for over 80 children, with ten full time employees. She credits much of her success to the support she has received from fellow members. "It's good to be able to put yourself around a lot of positive people. Here, everybody's cheering you on; even when you're having a rough time, they're still cheering you on. I was talking to another Good Work member the other day, and I said that I've finally gotten to the point where the business isn't running me any more. At last, I'm the one running the business." CP

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank Jennifer Sherwin and the Self-Help Credit Union for helping to collect lending data. I would also like to thank Debby Deter, Beverly El-Amin, Cynthia Williams-Hills, and all the dedicated members of Good Work.

Endnotes

1. The average white net worth is $43,800, versus $3,700 for blacks.
2. One large tract of Durham had a poverty rate more than 2.5 times the city average. Its household income was little more than a third of the county's as a whole, and its unemployment rate was over 4.5 times the county rate. Sources: Durham City/County Planning Department; North/East Central Durham Data Scan 1994; data and baseline comparisons from 1990 census.
3. Public incentives for luring the Mercedes-Benz plant to Alabama in 1994, for example, cost between $153,133 and $200,000 per job created.

References

Aspen Institute. Self-Employment Learning Project. 1994. Directory of U.S. Microenterprise Programs.

Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond. 1995. Community Investment Opportunities.

NC Equity. 1991. "What is a Woman Worth? North Carolina Women, Families & The Economy in Transition."

North Carolina Institute for Minority Economic Development. 1994. Minority Business Financing White Paper.

Oliver, Melvin and Thomas Shapiro. 1995. Black Wealth/ White Wealth: A New Perspective on Racial Inequality.

Roberts, Edward, 1991. MIT Sloan School of Management Study. Cited in Capital Opportunities for Small Businesses, The University of North Carolina's Small Business and Technology Development Center. 1992.

Schweke, William, Carl Rist, and Brian Dabson. 1994. Bidding for Business. Corporation for Enterprise Development.

United States Department of Labor. 1989. Facts on Working Women, No. 89-5.

The Streetscape Demonstration

Hugh Deaner and Francesca Turchi

During the summer of 1994, a small stretch of West Franklin Street in downtown Chapel Hill was transformed. Gone are uneven cracked pavement and mud. Instead, the sidewalk is freshly paved with smooth concrete and bordered with attractive Carolina red brick. Sturdy new benches invite passers-by to relax under shady trees, which are offset in brick planters. New streetlights improve the sense of security during evening hours, and unsightly power lines have been buried in underground vaults. Bicycle racks relieve the pressure on unintended alternative parking spots such as parking meters, signs, and small trees. "We love it," said Sharon Powell, manager of a local business. "It really brightens up the place. I think it's really helping get people out to see what's happening on West Franklin Street." Public Works Director Bruce Heflin agrees, "All the feedback we've gotten has been positive." The improvements demonstrate the elements of Streetscape, an ambitious downtown improvement component of Chapel Hill's comprehensive plan. Proponents never doubted the benefits of Streetscape and the pilot project was supported by target-area merchants from the start—or so it seemed.

Between the initial budgeting of $28,000 for a pilot project and its completion eighteen months later, the expected consensus broke down into an acrimonious battle pitting merchant against merchant and merchant against town. Some of the wounds remain raw. Although the Streetscape concept had been in discussion for five years, in this analysis we intend to assess what went wrong in those eighteen months. Ultimately, we hope to establish a framework by which similar "surprise" disputes, whether directly related to Streetscape or otherwise, can be avoided in the future.

The issues in the Streetscape pilot study dispute fall into two categories: design and process. Broad agreement existed among merchants and town officials concerning the physical condition of Chapel Hill's downtown streets. Long in need of repair, sidewalks were uneven and broken in places. Lighting, in the form of rather dim standard streetlights, was viewed as inadequate, especially in the wake of several well-publicized late-night assaults in the autumn of 1993. General agreement also existed concerning the importance of visual appearance in attracting downtown shoppers. Some disagreement emerged, however, with regard to what that appearance should be. Many politically-connected business leaders favored the Streetscape masterplan's contemporary-classic look of "understated elegance." However, a small but vocal minority believed that an essential part of Franklin Street's beloved character was its patina of age. The sentiments of this group are expressed well by a local merchant who said when she testified before the Town Council, "You have a golden opportunity to preserve, to defend, a small and unique remnant of old Chapel Hill. Or, you can let it be compromised and help it slide into a familiar pattern of mediocrity and sameness you've seen all over the country in town after town."

The second category of issues can be described as process-related. How did the town determine the site of the Streetscape pilot project and how did it communicate with stakeholders? Several merchants

***Hugh Deaner** and **Francesca Turchi** will receive the degrees of Master of Regional Planning and Master of Business Administration from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in May. Deaner will then be starting a business, Queue Corporation, in the Triangle. Turchi will work for the Urban Enterprise Corps.*

in the targeted zone were concerned that construction would severely disrupt their businesses. Others were offended at the town's "imposition" of Streetscape without—in their eyes—seeking involvement by the affected parties. In a more general context, the Streetscape project raises the issue of how to optimally manage differing preferences and expectations in a participatory democracy. Most would agree that trust between stakeholders is increased when decision-making incorporates the needs of all stakeholders and is damaged when the process is characterized by mistrust and recriminations. How can all parties learn from the example of Streetscape?

The Process

The aggressive opposition mounted by some merchants to the Streetscape project just as construction was to commence surprised town officials and other downtown merchants. Downtown revitalization had been a topic of local discussion long before the controversy began. The Streetscape Plan, which covers the length of Franklin Street roughly from Carrboro to Hillsborough Street, was conceived initially following a city visit in the late 1980s to Lexington, Kentucky by the Chapel Hill Public-Private Partnership, an ad hoc alliance that gathers periodically to address issues of concern to the town. In the wake of the interest generated by this trip, a local architect was contracted by the town in 1989 to prepare recommendations for a masterplan of downtown improvements. By January 1991, however, the town decided to complete the masterplan in-house, following some dissatisfaction with the pace and quality of the consultant's work. (See Table 1 for a complete project timeline.) Both the Planning Department and Public Works Department staffs were involved in the development of the Streetscape masterplan.

The November 1993 elections of a number of pro-business people to the Town Council were heralded as ushering in an era of enhanced relations between the business community and the Town of Chapel Hill. Although the Town Council had approved planning funds for Streetscape, the masterplan languished for lack of the almost $5 million in necessary funds to complete the project. In the same month as the elections, the Town Council formally adopted the Streetscape concept, adding it to Chapel Hill's comprehensive plan and making its design and style guidelines mandatory for new construction in the downtown area.

As they adopted Streetscape, the Council appropriated $28,000 for a pilot project in hopes of generating enthusiasm and financial momentum from the private sector. Addressing the possibility of increasing interest by building a "test strip," one Council member said, "We hope it does, because people will be more willing to give their efforts, energies and dollars. You need the enthusiastic support of people in town for a project of this size regardless of where the money comes from." At the same time, a member of the Downtown Commission signaled support and financial commitment by many in the business community, saying "The way it should happen is we do it a piece at a time and not all with public money."

Despite the pro-business elections, however, 1993 will probably be remembered by downtown shop owners as a rather melancholy year. Overall, downtown revenues were in a trough, perhaps due in part to the aftereffects of the recession of the early 1990s and to the reduction of available parking during construction of a new town-owned parking deck. In addition, numerous random assaults occurred on Franklin Street in the fall of 1993, following closely on the heels of the well-publicized murder of a jogger in another part of Chapel Hill. The town seemed to be losing its image as a tranquil village, safe from the ills that plagued many of America's urban areas. As if to punctuate the malaise, two long-time downtown merchants took their lives in separate suicides in November 1993.

Chapel Hill's Department of Public Works scheduled construction of the demonstration project between February and April of 1994. The site of the pilot project was identified by the town's Planning Department based upon two criteria. First, they wanted to build in a location that needed help, and second, they sought to renovate a site that would maximize the visual impact of the project in order to spawn the strong public support critical to implement additional Streetscape phases. Town staff made a conscious decision not to poll merchants—whose support they heard by word of mouth to be unanimous—regarding the location of the project site. In their minds, such polling would lead to pressure to build on a politically favored yet less than optimal site.

Immediately after the announcement of the project site, concerns were conveyed to the town that construction during the academic year would be too disruptive, that their businesses would suffer from a significant drop in foot traffic during the several months of closed sidewalks and messy worksites. In January 1994, following two orientation meetings

with Chapel Hill's Town Manager, Cal Horton, and town staff, merchants from the project area presented a petition to the Town Council pledging "wholehearted" support if several design elements were addressed. The proposed benches, for example, were seen as an "attractive nuisance," sure to encourage loitering and panhandling which would be harmful, they believed, to their businesses. Although Horton held firm on the benches, he agreed to reschedule construction for the summer when business was slower. "We're happy to make accommodations," Horton said. "We certainly don't want to harm anyone's business." Pledging to iron out details of the construction, Horton said, "It's essential we get off to a good start." The town, having followed through on many of the merchants' requests, assumed that their concerns had been satisfied.

Prior to the summer construction, many community leaders in both the public and private sectors continued to voice support for Streetscape. With an eye to comprehensive rather than piecemeal implementation, the Public-Private Partnership Streetscape Finance Committee was working on strategies to raise the funds necessary for such a substantial project. A meal tax proposed in 1993 raised enough ire that the suggestion was quickly abandoned. In 1994, a proposed bond issue funded by property tax revenues was also shelved. The local newspapers covered the plans for Streetscape, with particular attention paid as the merchants along the pilot project strip began to voice heretofore unexpressed frustrations.

In May 1994, town staff met with merchants to discuss the specifics and logistics of the construction schedule with the affected merchants. The meeting collapsed into a near-melee after only ten minutes, and it certainly signaled the beginning of open hostilities. Horton ended the meeting by stating, "If you don't want it [Streetscape], we'll just end this meeting right now and put it somewhere where they do want it."

In the wake of this disastrous encounter, the Town Council directed that all affected merchants and property owners be polled as to their support for or opposition to the project and simultaneously directed the Town Manager to investigate alternate sites. Merchants and town staff met again in June to complete the discussion on logistics. Although the gathering was tense, the town staff reiterated its commitment to keeping all stores accessible during the course of construction and to completing the project on time. Shortly thereafter, with the results of the poll indicating overwhelming support for the demonstration among both property owners and merchants, the Town Council voted to proceed over the merchants' objections. However, four of the affected merchants had retained an attorney, who threatened Horton with legal action if the town began construction.

Some merchants had convinced themselves that they were well on their way to being driven out of business by an uncaring burearucracy.

Curtis Brooks, the town's landscape architect and point-man in the Streetscape debate, felt in hindsight that the amount of emotion invested by the merchants in this dispute was at least partially a result of the nature of human interaction. As merchants voiced latent concerns among themselves, those concerns (fed by rumor) became fears which became paranoia, from which an opposition group coalesced. Misunderstandings or misinformation about the length of time necessary to complete the project contributed to solidifying the positional stance adopted by the opposing merchants. Eventually, some merchants had convinced themselves that they were well on their way to being driven out of business by an uncaring bureaucracy.

Outcome

Construction was undertaken and completed on schedule by the town's public works crew, without the threatened lawsuit. By all accounts, throughout their work, the crew was meticulous and took a number of measures to avoid disruption through such steps as undertaking demolition work at night and maintaining access to all shops at all times. At the halfway point, one merchant said, "I think they've been doing a good job, as far as we can tell. My basic impression is that it hasn't affected us as much as we'd expected." This attentiveness, plus the efforts of a Town Council member in generating local awareness of the fact that the businesses remained open during the project and in responding immediately in person to merchants who called the town with con-

Streetscape Project History

December 1989	RFP issued for Streetscape Masterplan work.
January 1990	Cogswell Hauser Associates hired as consultant; $30,000 encumbered from Capital Improvements Plan.
Fall 1990	Concerns arise regarding quality of consultant's work.
January 1991	Contract between consultant and Town dissolved; Town staff takes over project.
June 1991	RFP issued for Streetscape Lighting Plan.
November 1993	All survey and design work complete; Downtown Streetscape Masterplan submitted to Town Council and adopted; $28,000 in CIP earmarked for demonstration project.
December 1993	Plan presented to merchants within pilot project area.
January 1994	Merchants sign petition announcing "wholehearted support" but requesting design changes; town agrees to delay construction start date until Summer 1994.
April 1994	Town Council decides against $4.8 million bond issue to fund Streetscape.
May 1994	Meeting to brief merchants on construction schedule; tempers flare and the meeting is adjourned within ten minutes.
June 1994	Town Council requests a survey of area merchants and property owners and authorizes alternative site search; several merchants retain an attorney and threaten legal action if construction begins; second meeting between Town staff and merchants to discuss the construction schedule.
July 1994	Survey results indicate overwhelming support; Town Council votes 8-1 to proceed with the demonstration as originally sited; construction begins July 11 and is scheduled to last twelve weeks.
October 1994	Construction ends within the twelve week timeframe.

cerns, contributed substantially to smoothing the remaining ruffled feathers. Additionally, two merchants who felt solidarity with the "hard core opposition," and yet were willing to act as a voice of reason, played an important informal mediating role.

Two area restaurants served free sandwiches and iced tea to the work crews for the duration, and one offered two free dinners to all the construction workers. Other merchants were less willing to make amends after the work commenced. Angry and insulting signs appeared in some store windows, without regard for the morale of the work crews directly outside. One year later, two of the merchants remain acrimonious towards the town. At least one more remains unhappy with the design. Others' opinions fall between fairly pleased to very enthusiastic.

One affected merchant says he has given much thought to the Streetscape affair "because I don't like being that miserable." While not necessarily opposed to the improvements *per se*, his pique originated with the feeling that Streetscape was "rammed down our throats." From his perspective, the root of the dispute was the government's preference for dealing expeditiously with a single spokesperson, rather than polling all concerned parties. However, this person described the merchants' response as an "ad hoc alliance, not a coalition." Regular interaction among the merchants on his stretch of Franklin Street, while slightly greater than before, remains minimal and he does not expect long-term changes with regard to how the merchants represent themselves to government and vice versa.

In retrospect, Brooks, the town's landscape architect, says he would have polled merchants to confirm their interest and gauge their concerns immediately after funding was allocated. That is his intention for the next Streetscape phase. As this paper is being written, five new site options will be presented to the Town Council in order to choose two finalists. Preliminary design has been completed for all five sites, enabling the town to move quickly whichever site is chosen. Brooks has delivered letters to all potentially affected owners and merchants outlining the town's plans and announcing a meeting to discuss construction logistics. Individuals representing three of seventy potentially affected businesses attended the meeting. Three others telephoned. In the wake of generally positive reviews of both the aesthetics of the Streetscape project and the construction process, Brooks expects wide support for the next round but will travel door-to-door to discuss Streetscape with

merchants in the two finalist sites and will hold at least one more meeting.

Analysis and Lessons for the Future

Streetscape is a useful case for planners because it illustrates how a fairly minor and seemingly harmonious issue can prove to be a source of great agony for all parties involved. While this was a potential win-win project for all the major stakeholders, it nonetheless became an inflamed and positional dispute. As planners, these are the types of conflicts it pays to avoid since many other battles are distributive in nature and will require plenty of time and effort to resolve fairly and satisfactorily. This style of dispute is often difficult to anticipate and prepare for, however, since it is often not clear that there is a dispute until it is full-blown.

The hard core opponents were so stirred up that they were unable to recognize their own underlying interests.

The structure used by the town in communicating with merchants, for example, did not promote direct expression of concerns by a variety of stakeholders nor was it useful in building support for the project as a whole, which was certainly a major interest of the town's. The technical details were in place, the political details were not, and the resulting emotional fallout jeopardized the project.

This case demonstrates the difficulty of negotiating and mediating simultaneously, especially with groups that may not fully understand the planning process. Different actors have different views, and planners must make practical judgments as to "Who really speaks for the neighborhood?" (Forester 1992, 305) In the case of Streetscape, one supporter was taken as the "speaker," and other actors who were unfamiliar with the process were left out until they were angered enough to speak up. It may have been helpful to have a defined "planner-regulator" or a more disinterested "process manager" serve as a facilitator between the Public Works staff (who were the "developers" here) and affected parties rather than forcing the staff member responsible for implementing the project to act as the mediator as well. The nonneutrality of that role probably undermined the process and certainly was highlighted as misunderstandings and rumors about dates of construction swirled among the merchants. One Town Council member and several merchants attempted to fill the volunteer mediator role later in the dispute, with some apparent success, however.

Guidelines for effective consensus building and collaborative problem solving provide a solid framework to follow. If the town had used techniques such as mutual education, problem definition, or vision definition[1] early in the planning process and prior to the selection of the pilot project site, they may have been able to alleviate some of the necessity for the dispute resolution techniques necessary later on by providing an "early warning system" for the town. As we noted at the beginning, participatory democracy is difficult as the town did not want "too many cooks" involved in the design process, probably for fear of slowing down the process. The choice to not solicit input resulted instead in a tense and unpleasant experience for both town and merchants. Obviously, every town initiative cannot be a completely public action. However, particularly in the case of first-time projects, that investment in building good working relationships early and in making some procedural agreements along the way can have significant payoffs in terms of time saved later in the project. Since emotion outweighed reason by the time the Streetscape dispute became full blown, the chance for a truly open and collaborative process was lost.

The hard core opponents were so stirred up that they were unable to recognize their own underlying interests or hear what measures the town was willing to take to address those needs. Instead, threats flew and the project was maligned without regard to "getting to yes."[2] The town, however, did a decent job of challenging perceptions of institutional oafishness by making changes in the dates of construction and in accommodating a number of design-related requests. Furthermore, the efforts of one Town Council member to build bridges surprised some of the merchants and was crucial for their eventual support of the project.

The town might have stressed the potential for mutual gain in order to reduce the impression of "imposition." Many merchants were able to see this potential but a few became so hardened in a positional bargaining mode that they were easily able to over-

look likely gains. The slightly different cultural perspective of one restaurant owner was interesting. He was thrilled to "get something for nothing" from the government and although he was concerned about the disruption, he could see the potential for a very positive outcome.

This dispute also illustrates that stakeholders peripheral to the main issue, such as the media, can influence the progression of the dispute and the type and substance of the eventual outcome. As several parties involved with the Streetscape dispute noted, government is often perceived as big and insensitive. The media never fail to portray that insensitivity in grueling detail despite efforts to accommodate the wishes of as many stakeholders as possible. Since, to quote the town's landscape architect, "it's not fun being half the story," planners and town representatives must look at even the most humdrum local planning issues from the perspective of the local media early in the process. Armed with the understanding of the value of conflict to the local media, planners will perhaps incorporate some additional measures into preliminary planning efforts to head off potential "headline goldmines." By identifying some of the issues ripe for media coverage and exploitation early in the process, planners may be able to defuse them through careful handling.

Conclusion

Much of the analysis section concentrates on the town, to the point that a reader may think we blame the town for the dispute. We do not mean to implicate the town, especially considering the childish and positional behavior on the part of a few of the merchants. We do, however, think that it is incumbent on the town to "pre-mediate" new projects as if they were going to become acrimonious in order to recognize and head off potential conflicts. This step was missing during the first phase of Streetscape but seems to have become an important part of the preparation for future phases. CP

Endnotes

1. See Godschalk *et al.* 1994.
2. See Fisher, Ury, and Patton 1991.

References

Fisher, Ury and Patton. 1991. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In.* New York: Penguin Books.

Forester. 1992. "Planning in the Face of Conflict: Negotiation and Mediation Strategies in Local Land Use Regulation," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 53, no. 3: 303-314.

Godschalk, David *et al.* 1994. *Pulling Together: A Planning and Development Consensus-Building Manual.* Urban Land Institute. Workbook.

The Undergraduate Planning Degree in North Carolina: East Carolina University and Appalachian State Universtiy

Wes Hankins and Garry Cooper

Within the past ten years, undergraduate planning education has received greater attention.[1] While a significant body of literature exists on undergraduate planning education at the national level, little attention has been focused on the two undergraduate degree programs located in North Carolina: East Carolina University (ECU) and Appalachian State University (ASU). This paper will provide a brief history and assess the impact of these two programs.

East Carolina University

East Carolina University has offered an undergraduate planning minor since 1963 and a Bachelor of Science in Urban and Regional Planning since the Spring of 1974. Historically, the ECU program has maintained approximately 60 undergraduate majors/minors with approximately 25-30 graduates per year. In 1982, the faculty made a commitment to strive for recognition of the undergraduate planning degree by the American Planning Association (now accreditation by the Planning Accreditation Board). The latter initiative was in keeping with the North Carolina Chapter of the American Institute of Planners 1973 statement on planning education: "NCAIP should provide strong support to develop at least one bachelor's program in planning at a university in the state that fully meets AIP accreditation standards."

Wes Hankins is a professor in the Urban and Regional Planning Program in the School of Industrial Technology at East Carolina University. Garry Cooper, AICP, serves as Associate Professor of Community and Regional Planning and is the Planning Program Coordinator for the undergraduate planning degree program at Appalachian State University.

Since the mid-1980s the planning program at ECU has undergone a number of changes. First, it has acquired an international element in both teaching and research. During this time ECU hosted approximately 50 students from Malaysia. Upon graduating with the undergraduate degree, almost all of these students completed graduate planning degrees at universities within the United States. In addition, the planning faculty has been involved in significant research/service activities abroad. Dr. Mulatu Wubneh has made a number of trips to Africa as an economic development consultant for the World Bank and the United Nations Development Program. Dr. Richard Stephenson was involved in a Middle East archeological research project in Jordan during the summer of 1995 and will return to Jordan in the summer of 1996 to continue this research project. Professor Shen Guoqiang, who joined the planning faculty in 1994, has conducted housing and land economics research in Beijing, People's Republic of China.

A second important change was the separation of planning from the Department of Geography and Planning in 1993. The planning program was reestablished as a Department within the School of Industry and Technology. While retaining its traditional ties to the Social Sciences, the Department of Planning is establishing new relationships at the undergraduate and graduate levels with the professional curricula located in the School of Industry and Technology and other professional schools. With the establishment of the Planning Department, the planning program acquired a fourth full-time faculty position. The addition of Professor Shen Guoqiang added important teaching and research expertise in geographic information systems and computer aided design (GIS/CAD), quantitative methods, urban design, and transportation. The four full-time faculty

members are periodically augmented with visiting lecturers in planning. These visiting planning faculty hold a graduate degree in planning and usually teach one course per semester.

Third, the planning faculty has been active in a variety of capacities within the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP). Professors Hankins, Wubneh, and Stephenson served as co-editors of *UPDATE*, the ACSP newsletter. Hankins was a member of the ACSP Commission on Undergraduate Education and served two terms as a regional representative on the ACSP Board. He is completing his second term as Secretary-Treasurer of the Association.

Finally, during 1995 the planning faculty at ECU completely revised the undergraduate curriculum in planning to address recent trends in planning education and practice. This revision reflected suggestions contained in a consultant's report prepared shortly after the establishment of the Department.

The new degree requirements include the following major elements: 15 semester hours (s.h.) of required planning courses, 12 s.h. of required skill courses (computer applications, technical writing, public speaking, and quantitative methods), 9 s.h. in one of three planning tracks, 9 s.h. of planning electives, plus one or two minor concentrations for a minimum of 24 semester hours. The planning tracks are Urban Planning and Design, Regional Planning and International Development, and Environmental Resources Planning and Management. The revised curriculum places considerable emphasis on introducing the latest computer technology. To support this initiative the Department of Planning has acquired computer equipment to support GIS/CAD instruction in the Planning Studio and a lab in the School of Industry and Technology

To date, approximately 800 students have graduated from ECU with either an undergraduate major or minor, or the graduate level planning concentration. In 1989, on the 25th anniversary of the ECU planning program, the faculty developed a survey to assess alumni opinion regarding undergraduate planning education at ECU. Of approximately 600 alumni identified in 1989, a questionnaire was mailed to 340 for whom current addresses were available; 164 questionnaires were returned.

Of the alumni returning the survey, 71 percent graduated with a planning major and 29 percent with a planning minor. When they enrolled at ECU, 82 percent were from North Carolina, 12 percent from Virginia, and 6 percent from other states or countries. Following graduation, 58 percent secured their first job in planning. Of this 58 percent, 61 percent obtained their first planning job in the public sector. Approximately 60 percent were currently employed in planning and 50 percent were enrolled in or had completed a graduate degree program. The most popular discipline at the graduate level was Public Administration, with Planning and Geography close behind. The majority (82 percent) of the ECU undergraduate planning alumni felt that they were well prepared for an entry level planning position, and 86 percent believed that their undergraduate planning education prepared them well for graduate school. Of those that had not been employed as a planner since graduating from ECU, 98 percent felt that their planning education had been useful to them as a citizen in their community and 78 percent found their planning education useful in their professional work. Finally, when asked if they would still pursue a planning major or minor at ECU if they had the chance to do it over again, approximately 70 percent of the ECU alumni responded affirmatively.

> The majority of ECU planning alumni feel that they were well prepared for an entry-level planning position.

Appalachian State University

The Department of Geography and Planning at Appalachian State University (ASU) offers a bachelor of science degree in Community and Regional Planning. The ASU planning program began in 1975 and the first degrees were bestowed in 1977. Over 100 students have earned this planning degree since the program's inception. The ASU planning program is small by design. It typically has a total enrollment of 16-20 majors and approximately 15 minors, with 4-5 majors graduating each school year.

Job prospects for Appalachian State graduates are steady. Presently, students with GIS skills are the most marketable. Appalachian students have an excellent

reputation for their applied skills. Most planning students are able to find jobs in their disciplines.

There are two bills presently before the North Carolina legislature that propose expanded, mandated land use planning in the state. One bill would mandate planning in the mountain regions, and the other would mandate planning state-wide. Presently, the only mandated state planning is for the coastal area. The passage of either proposed legislative act would significantly increase the need for enty-level planners, particularly in western North Carolina.

The Appalachian State planning program specifically targets public sector societal needs in North Carolina. Most graduates from this program at least initially seek employment in small towns and rural counties in the Piedmont and mountain areas of the state. The employment analysis for program graduates from May 1977 through December 1994 indicates that 47 percent are in planning or planning-related jobs, 13 percent are in non-planning-related jobs, while the employment for 40 percent is unknown. In addition, 75 percent of graduates in planning or planning-related jobs work for the public sector in some capacity, and 72 percent of these graduates work in North Carolina.

The Department of Geography and Planning has only one full-time planning faculty member who spends greater than 50 percent of his time in support of the program. This person frequently involves students in planning outreach projects within the region. The department additionally has eight full-time geography faculty, one half-time geography faculty, one GIS Laboratory Supervisor (who also teaches a limited course load), and 2-4 adjunct planning faculty who teach on a temporary and part-time basis. Adjunct faculty generally teach additional sections of the introductory course in planning. These faculty members are practicing planners with either a master's degree or certification from the American Institute of Certified Planners. Although they bring to the classroom significant professional experience and are an important contribution to program quality, the pool of available planners qualified to be adjunct planning faculty is small due to Appalachian's rural location.

A student working toward a Bachelor of Science in Community and Regional Planning must complete several program component requirements prior to graduation: the University core curriculum, environmental literacy (two designated 3 s.h. courses in physical geography and cultural geography), the technical core (40 s.h. of designated planning, geography, and statistics courses), interdisciplinary bridges (21 s.h. of designated courses within several colleges), and electives. Additionally, most students develop two or more planning specialties from among thirteen different 9 s.h. specialty tracks.

The ECU and ASU Undergraduate Planning Degree Programs Compared

Although the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill offers the master's degree and doctorate in planning and several other institutions in North Carolina offer undergraduate planning minors or concentrations, only ASU and ECU offer an undergraduate planning degree. Both of these undergraduate degrees were authorized to fill the need for entry-level planners within North Carolina. Both programs lack a graduate degree in planning and Planning Accreditation Board (PAB) accreditation. However, both programs have numerous alumni who have pursued graduate degrees in planning or related fields. ASU and ECU both stress interdisciplinary relationships with other academic units, computer skills, and experiential learning opportunities within a small class setting.

The ASU planning program specifically targets public sector societal needs in North Carolina.

Both ECU and ASU have been active within the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning. ECU Professors Hankins and Wubneh and retired ASU faculty member Robert Reiman coedited the first three editions of the American Collegiate Schools of Planning's *Guide to Undergraduate Education in Urban and Regional Planning and Related Fields*. Reiman and Garry Cooper of ASU edited the fourth edition of the *Guide*. In addition, the planning faculty of both undergraduate degree programs have historically supported the activities of the North Carolina Chapter of the American Planning Association (NCAPA). Examples of these contributions include serving as chapter president and other offices, editing the chapter newsletters and directory, and serving as the repository for the archives of NCAPA and

its predecessor, the North Carolina Chapter of the American Institute of Planners.

Some differences exist between the two programs. A principal difference is the recent creation of a separate Department of Planning at East Carolina University with a related increase to four full-time planning faculty. These changes reflect a continuing commitment on the part of the ECU planning faculty to ultimately seek PAB accreditation for the undergraduate planning degree. Another difference is the larger number of planning majors and graduates historically associated with the ECU program, including a substantial number of international students. The ECU program also has a significant international research focus involving countries in Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. The Appalachian State program is distinct in having a strong linkage with the Town and County Management Program in the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice, by which most of the students obtain a minor in planning. CP

Endnotes

1. Examples include the report of the American Collegiate Schools of Planning Commission on Undergraduate Education, "Creating the Future for Undergraduate Education," *JPER*, Fall, 1990, Vol. 10, No. 1; "Educating Undergraduates in Planning: Characteristics and Prospects," *JPER*, Spring, 1993, Vol 12, No. 3; and the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th editions of the *Guide to Undergraduate Education in Urban and Regional Planning and Related Fields*.

Teaching Kids About Planning

Steve Gurley

Every planner has probably given some thought to teaching kids about planning, and some have had the opportunity to do this from time to time during their professional careers. Many of us have been asked by a classroom teacher in our community to tell students about what we do on the job. Some of us may have been given opportunities to go further and teach about specific elements of our profession. Hopefully, this report will instill an added desire to get into the classroom and teach the future generation about planning. In this article, I hope to:

1. Encourage planners to teach kids about our profession and how it impacts society,
2. Provide a brief overview of the American Planning Association's efforts to teach kids about planning,
3. Explain recent and past efforts by the North Carolina Chapter of the American Planning Association (NCAPA) to teach kids about planning, including efforts of NCAPA to establish a planning exhibit at Discovery Place in Charlotte,
4. Provide a partial listing of resources available for teaching kids about planning, and
5. Suggest ideas on how to get the most out of a classroom visit, for you the planner as well as the students.

Steve Gurley, AICP, is the Director of the Lincolnton Planning Department. Before becoming a planner, Gurley taught seventh grade in the Beaufort County School System in Belhaven, North Carolina. Gurley heads the Youth Education program for the NCAPA Executive Committee. If you would like more information about teaching kids about planning, contact him at the Lincolnton Planning Department.

APA and NCAPA Efforts to Teach Kids about Planning

The American Planning Association (APA) is putting a great deal of effort into teaching kids about planning. APA resources for teaching kids, described later in this report, are more numerous than they were just a few years ago. Planners Day in School, a successful effort to put planners into high school classes in the city hosting the American Planning Association national conference, has been a mainstay of the past several conferences. APA has also made numerous publications and sources of information available to assist in teaching kids about planning. These efforts have given us many tools and ideas to help in formulating plans for teaching kids at the local level.

Teaching kids about planning has been a sporadic activity for NCAPA. In the early 1970s, Jim Hinkley, then president of the North Carolina Chapter of the American Institute of Planners, together with several other planners, created a Planning Information Kit including a film bibliography, lists of simulation games and filmstrip programs, a list of colleges and universities in North Carolina offering bachelor's degrees in urban planning, a lecture presentation outline, and pamphlets on planning. This kit was used throughout the state, particularly in the Raleigh, Gastonia, Salisbury, Winston-Salem, and Greensboro areas for two to three years. The kit was last updated in 1994, and it includes materials such as the "APA Public Information Guide IX: Teaching Kids About Planning," "Ideas for the Classroom," and other re-

sources that will give you ideas about telling students about planning.

The current effort to teach kids about planning began in the early 1990s. The impetus for the latest thrust came from several planners across the state. Sue Schwartz, Judy Hunt, and I made a presentation on teaching kids about planning at the 1993 NCAPA annual spring conference. The following year, Planners Day in School (PDIS) was instituted as part of the NCAPA annual conference. Planners visited Jordan High School in Durham, where they spoke with government classes about planning. The Social Studies faculty at Jordan High welcomed us with open arms, and the only drawback was that there were not enough planners to cover all government classes. Unfortunately, we faced the same situation at the 1995 conference.

Another project that NCAPA has been working on is the creation of a planning display at Discovery Place, a hands-on museum in Charlotte, North Carolina. During late 1994 and into the summer of 1995, a study group made up largely of NCAPA members and representatives from Discovery Place met to establish plans for an exhibit. Discovery Place has accepted our proposal for an exhibit, and we are now waiting for a signal to start the project.

So far, several planners across the state have agreed to work on the project. In addition, Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc. (ESRI) will provide one complimentary copy of ESRI's ArcView geographic information system (GIS) software and one day of staff programming and technical preparation of the GIS portion of the exhibit. ESRI will also assist with coordinating GIS users and/or students who will further develop this portion of the exhibit.

Many ideas are being considered for the Discovery Place exhibit. In addition to the GIS exhibit, we hope to put together a watershed model to help viewers better understand the intricacies of watershed planning. Other possible features include neighborhood models and hands-on exhibits intended to give the observer a better understanding of planning. Once in place, we feel that the exhibit will be a great tool for teaching kids about planning.

The NCAPA Executive Committee passed a resolution in January 1995 endorsing the Discovery Place Exhibit. Both the Virginia and Georgia Chapters of APA have submitted similar resolutions in support of the exhibit.

Getting into the Classroom

If you want to visit students in your community, you first need to arrange a visit. While I am generally contacted by teachers to speak to their classes, we must often make teachers aware of the materials we have to offer before we can get an invitation into the classroom. For example, I am preparing to meet with the principal and the third grade teachers of a local elementary school where I will be sharing the "Planning Education, Kids Style" program package (described later in this article) with them in anticipation of being invited to do the program in three third grade classes there. I initiated this effort on my own. Although I do not know if school personnel will be willing to follow through with the program, I will give them a thorough overview and make myself available to carry out the program with their assistance. I have also been invited to speak to high school home economics classes about planning. At first, I thought a home economics classroom might be an awkward environment for teaching planning. However, I found that their study of community fits well with many of the basics of planning.

> In my experience, the key is making yourself available.

In my experience, the key is making yourself available. Sometimes you will be invited to teach and teach again, but frequently you need to stay in contact with school teachers and administrators if you want to come back in the future.

Resources Available to Teach Kids About Planning

The 1995 *Planners Bookstore Catalogue* lists no fewer than 16 individual resources for teaching kids about planning. Prices range from about five dollars for short books to $75 for detailed guidebooks, lesson plans, and other tools for teaching.

"My Planning Activity Book" is an excellent coloring book that gives a young child an opportunity to learn about planning. For older children, there are two good publications by the Urban Land Institute that have been available since the early nineties: "Dilemmas of Development" and "UrbanPlan." These are geared for high school students and contain planning curricula that can fill several class periods. "Dilemmas in Development" focuses on a planned use development in northern Virginia and

the various compromises that came about in its establishment. It presents some excellent examples of how local government can work with the development community to protect the public interest. "UrbanPlan" focuses on an urban redevelopment project (Quality Hill) in Kansas City, Missouri. It examines the intricacies of revitalizing an urban neighborhood in great detail.

"Planning Education, Kid Style" is an excellent tool that was developed by the Tennessee Chapter of APA for grades 3-6. It includes a manual and video, and uses the "box city" concept—putting together a small "city" using boxes as buildings—as a teaching tool. This activity allows the kids to put ideas into practice in a hands-on way by designing buildings and building cities. It is an excellent tool for teaching the concepts of space and community to students, especially since it helps show the interrelatedness of land uses. Additionally, local boards or elected officials can get involved since the box cities created by the students can be reviewed much as a planning board and city council or board of county commissioners would review a zoning matter. Not included in the resource packet are the boxes and street grid layout needed to put the box city together. You are left to create them yourself or order them separately.

Other promising materials listed in the latest APA Planner's Bookstore Catalogue include:

1. *How Things Were Built*, a children's book that shows how many of the world's greatest structures were built and explains technology that allowed for their construction;

2. *Little Planner*, a board game that teaches the most basic planning concepts by having players build projects using scaled-down plans;

3. *Underground*, a book for older children that exposes the root system of a typical city intersection;

4. *The Challenge of Change*, a 15-minute video focusing on how planning works and why it is rewarding and challenging by explaining how planners help preserve natural resources, enhance community character, do transit planning and help provide attractive and affordable housing;

5. *The Changing American Cityscape*, a series of seven posters with accompanying text showing how the built environment of an imaginary city evolves over 115 years;

6. *Investing in Our Future: A Handbook for Teaching Local Government*, which presents guidelines for setting up programs designed to teach elementary and secondary school students about local government;

7. *Community as a Learning Resource*, a guidebook and video with hands-on exercises to help educators teach about the built environment and planning; and

8. *Walk Around the Block*, a book with a ready-to-use curriculum to teach children about architectural design and city planning by showing kids how to evaluate buildings, neighborhoods, and cities.

Some Tips for the Classroom

Here are a few tips for working with students in the classroom. Some of these are based on the excellent publication, "APA Public Information Guide IX: Teaching Kids About Planning," while others are techniques that have been helpful to me.

First of all, do not talk too much. Children have limited attention spans, and ten minutes of introductory remarks is plenty for elementary students. Middle school students can handle up to half an hour, and high school students can generally last a full class period. In my experience, however, activities should take up most of the classroom time regardless of the age of the group. Use hands-on activities to allow students to participate.

Use simple explanations. Refrain from using planning jargon more than necessary. If you must introduce a planning term, do not use another planning term to define it. One of the best ways to introduce a concept to kids is to provide real life examples of how a familiar planning activity affects them in a personal way.

Maintain order in the classroom. Expect some unruliness, but do not let it get out of hand. Certain rules, such as requiring that students raise their hands for permission to speak, must be kept to ensure the best results from your visit. This does not mean that you should follow a rigid schedule at all costs. Instead, be flexible, maintain a sense of humor, and expect the unexpected, especially with younger students. If things do not go as planned, improvise as

you go. Some of the best learning experiences can evolve from such situations.

Here are three ways to stimulate discussion among students and get them to think about planning:

1. Ask students to compare good characteristics of their neighborhoods with bad characteristics and discuss how planning can enhance the good qualities and negate the bad points.

2. Ask students to visualize the perfect neighborhood. How would it be different from their present neighborhoods?

3. Give students a map with "my house" in the center of it. Ask them to sketch the different types of land uses in their neighborhood that are needed in order for the neighborhood to function (i.e. school, park, grocery store, hospital, offices, industrial uses, etc.). Ask them to arrange the uses to achieve the most compatibility of land uses.

Conclusion

Teaching kids about planning is a great opportunity for planners to get involved in working with their future constituents. Planners can help kids become better informed about what planning is and why it is important while teaching them about local government and preparing them to become responsible adult citizens. GP

Call for Papers

Carolina Planning

Carolina Planning is a student-run publication of the Department of City and Regional Planning at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Our journal focuses on issues and topics relevant to practicing planners in the southeastern United States, including:

Case Studies
Coastal Zone Planning
Community and Economic Development
Environmental Quality and Open Space Preservation
Historic Preservation Planning
Housing
Land Use
National Issues
Policy Innovations
State, Regional, or Local Planning
Transportation

Submission Guidelines

Send submissions or queries to: *Carolina Planning*, Department of City and Regional Planning, CB #3140, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599. Questions can be directed to the editors at this address or through electronic mail at: cp.dcrp@mhs.unc.edu. Manuscripts should be original works between 10 and 25 pages in length (approximately 3000 -7500 words), typed, and double-spaced. Two copies should be submitted. Manuscripts will not be returned. A copy should be provided on a 3.5" computer diskette in WordPerfect format or ASCII text in addition to the two paper copies. All citations should follow the author-date system described in the *Chicago Manual of Style*, with endnotes used for explanatory text. Tables and graphics should be camera ready. It is the author's responsibility to obtain permission to use tables and graphics which have been previously published. A brief abstract not to exceed 100 words and a 2-3 sentence biographical sketch should accompany each submission, along with the author's name, address, telephone number, and e-mail address if available. *Carolina Planning* reserves the right to edit articles accepted for publication, subject to the author's approval.

Carolina Planning
The University of North Carolina
CB# 3140, New East Building
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3140

Non-Profit Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 177
Chapel Hill, N.C. 27599-1110

NORTH CAROLINA COLLECTION
WILSON LIBRARY, CB# 3930
CHAPEL HILL, NC 27599

Carolina Planning